

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

Wednesday, 3rd December 1952.

The House met in the Assembly Chamber, Government Estate, Mount Road, Madras, at half-past ten of the clock, Mr. Speaker (THE HON. SRI J. SIVASHANMUGAM PILLAI) in the Chair.

I.—QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

STARRED QUESTIONS.

Famine works in Palnad taluk, Guntur district.

* 228 Q.—SRI K. SUBBA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have sanctioned any famine works, in the famine declared area of Palnad taluk, Guntur district;

(b) whether it is a fact that the roads from Thummurugodu to Macherla and Macherla to Ethipothala are sanctioned as the famine relief works; and

(c) why the Government have not yet started the above mentioned works?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—

“(a) One work relating to the formation of an earthen road from Durgi to Kakirala was sanctioned and has since been completed. Steps are being taken to increase the minor irrigation works.

“(b) & (c) The question of sanctioning the road for Thummurugodu to Macherla is still under consideration. The work of forming a road from Macherla to Ethipothala was sanctioned as a security work last year and a grant of Rs. 75,000 was also sanctioned to the Guntur District Board for executing the work. The work has not however been taken up. It is no longer required for security purposes. No application has been received for executing it as a relief work.”

SRI K. SUBBA REDDI:—“ఎప్పుడు కరువుతోటి రాధపడుతున్న టువంటి ఈ లాల్‌కాల్ మేము కొన్ని Minor Irrigation పనులు, కొన్ని P.W.D. పనులు సూచించాము. వాటిని కనీసము ఈ సంవత్సరమైన తిమ్మలూ పెట్టవరా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“Yes, Sir. We are awaiting certain proposals from the Collector. The Famine Commissioner also has suggested some proposals.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA:—“కరువు పరిస్థితులు ఇంత తీవ్రంగా ఉంది ప్రజలు నానాభాధలు పడుతున్న పుటికినీ, ప్రభుత్వము ఇంకా ఈ టైము నివారణపనుల్ని తీసు కొనక ఉండడం చాలా విచారకరంగా ఉంది. కనుక ఇప్పుడైన వెంటనే ఈ పనులు చేరంపిస్తారా?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—

“The situation has improved a little after the last rains.”

[3rd December 1952]

SRI D. LAKSHMAYYA :—“వల్సాడు తాలూకాలో రెండు సంవత్సరాల నుంచి వర్షాలు లేనందున పంటలు లేకుండా కరువుతో ప్రజలు వాధపడుతున్నారనే విషయము ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలుసు కదా ! కనుక ఈ సంవత్సరము పన్నులు వసూలు చేస్తారా ?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
“I am afraid, Sir, that this is a different question.”

Contour bunding scheme in Vayalpad taluk.

* 232 Q.—**SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is proposed to continue the contour bunding scheme in Vayalpad taluk of Chittoor district; and

(b) if not, the reasons for the same?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—

“(a) & (b) The question of continuing the contour bunding scheme in the area specified is under the consideration of the Government.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ప్రస్తుతము ఈ కాంటూరు బండింగు (contour bunding) స్కీము వాయల్పాడు తాలూకాలో తిరిగిపొడిగించేలోగా, ఈ ప్రాంతాలలో కరువు ఎక్కువగా వున్నందువలన, కరువు వావులు సంభవిస్తున్నందువలన ప్రభుత్వము ఇక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి నడిమిచర్ల నడిబండగ, కలకడ మొదలైనటువంటి చెరువులకు సరైయి చానల్స్ కట్టించారా ? దీనివల్ల ఎంతోమందికి పనులు కలుగుతాయి కాబట్టి వీటిని కరువు పనుల కింద తీసికొంటారా ?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“A total area of 928 acres in Chittoor taluk and 610 acres in Vayalpad taluk has so far been contour bunded. The question of extending contour bunding to other areas is under the consideration of the Government.”

SRI N. SIVARAMI REDDI :—“ఈ contour bunding scheme ను మేను పరిస్థితులున్నటువంటి ఇతర జిల్లాలలోకూడా ఎందుకు అవరణలో పెట్టారు ? ఇతర జిల్లాలకు కడప, కర్నూలు ఇతర రాయలసీమలోని జిల్లాలలోకూడా ఈ స్కీమును apply చేయాలని కోరుతున్నాను.”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“As and when it arises, it will also be considered.”

Repairs to Vayali-Malayadipatti tank, Sankarankoil taluk.

* 233 Q.—**SRI P. URKAVALAN :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) what is the estimate for repairs to the Vayali-Malayadipatti tank in the Sankarankoil taluk;

(b) whether the ryots have given an assurance that they would give financial assistance for the repair of the aforesaid tank;

3rd December 1952]

(c) what is the reason for the aforesaid scheme being delayed still; and

(d) when the work will be commenced and completed?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) Rs. 5·8 lakhs.

“(b) The ryots have expressed their willingness to pay a contribution.

“(c) & (d) The scheme has been investigated and plans and estimates are being finalised by the Superintending Engineer. On their receipt, the scheme has to be examined with reference to its revenue, financial, and Grow More Food aspects. It cannot be said now, when the scheme will be sanctioned.”

Gazetted Officers of the Co-operative Department.

* 234 Q.—SRI K. VINAYAKAM : Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) the strength of the Co-operative Department under the following heads:

(i) Co-operative Sub-Registrars; and

(ii) Co-operative Deputy Registrars;

(b) how many of them in each category are Brahmans, non-Brahmans (forward and backward), Muslims, Christians and Scheduled Castes;

(c) the number of Christians who have been recruited or promoted after the assumption of office by the present Registrar of Co-operative Societies; and

(d) the number of promoted Christians who have superseded other community men?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“(a) Co-operative Sub-Registrars 388; and Deputy Registrars 96.

“(b)

	Deputy Registrars.	Co-operative Sub-Registrars.
Brahmans ..	24	113
Non-Brahmans.	41	191
Jain ..	1	1
Backward classes	9	14
Muslims ..	4	27
Christians ..	13	37
Scheduled classes	4	5
	96	388

“(c) Deputy Registrars 6; and Co-operative Sub-Registrars 20.

“(d) Promotions are not made on communal basis.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“Sir, in view of the long detailed answer given by the Hon. Minister, may I suggest to him and to his department to furnish a statement to us so that we might

[3rd December 1952]

go through it and then put supplementary questions? Is it a fact that many of the Christian officials have been shown better treatment like promotions, etc., in preference to others by the present Registrar of Co-operative Societies?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"The answer in an emphatic 'No', Sir."

SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO :—"அத்யக்ஷ, தாங்களால் இன்ன புவகஸி ரிசுட்டாண்ட் கார்டு நின்று பாதுகலது பௌதின புவகஸி subordinate staff ஸு கார்டா அநகா அம்தராநிவாஸ்கா வுவி பாக்ஸு காலா அகோரகா அநகரிக் காலா காமுஸுந்நா ரிசு விவயஸு கும்பிகாரி ப்ரப்திக் விவிநதா."

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"ஸப்யஸ்காரு பீஸின புவகஸி ப்ரப்திகு ப்ரஸுபஸு ப்ரப்திகு இன்ன புவகஸி ப்ரப்திகு விபு ஸபாநகஸுலேபந கலியசேஸுந்நா ஸு."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—"Sir, arising out of the answer 'emphatic no', may I ask the Hon. Minister whether he will be pleased to assure this House that if specific instances of this kind are brought to his notice, he will institute an enquiry and redress the grievances?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"If specific instances are brought to the notice of the Government, I assure hon. Members that suitable enquiries will be instituted and proper action will be taken."

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—"May I ask, Sir, whether the Government are adopting any policy in making appointments and promotions so as to give preference or encouragement to Backward Classes and Harijans? If the answer is in the affirmative, may I ask whether the figures given in respect of Backward Classes and Harijans are in proportion to their total population?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"It is a well known fact that Government have been giving due consideration to the Harijans and Backward Classes. But I cannot at the moment say whether the figures I have given are in proportion to their population."

10-40
a.m.

SRI A. GOVINDASAMY NAYAGAR :—"கிருஸ்துவர்களுக்கு தனிச் சலுகை கொடுப்பதற்காகவேண்டி பிப்ப் ரிஜிஸ்தரர்களாக, கிருஸ்துவர்களுடைய நிலமிப்பது மந்திரி அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியுமா?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—"It is not relevant to the publication."

Artesian wells in South Arcot.

* 235 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) How many artesian wells the Government have so far started in Vadalur taluk, South Arcot district, and how many of them are working at present and the minimum and maximum cost of each artesian well:

(b) whether it is a fact that Rs. 30 is fixed as water-cess per acre in that locality and if so, on what basis the water-cess is so calculated; and

3rd December 1952]

(c) whether any representations have been made to the Government to reduce the water-cess and if so, what action has been taken by the Government?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) There is no such taluk as Vadalur taluk in South Arcot district. Presumably, the hon. Member refers to Cuddalore taluk.

Three artesian wells have so far been sunk in Cuddalore taluk. Of these, only two proved to be successful and are now working. The actual cost of one of these two wells (well sunk in Kolakundy village) is Rs. 7,455 while that of the other (well sunk in Nainakuppam village) is Rs. 6,981.

The probable cost of each artesian well has been estimated by the Government at Rs. 8,000. The cost however varies with the depth up to which the bore is required to be taken in each case to tap artesian springs adequate for irrigation purposes.

“(b) The water cess fixed for irrigation from the artesian wells in the locality is Rs. 22-8-0 per acre per annum and not Rs. 30. This rate has been fixed on the basis of the water cess charged in the case of dufassal crops raised in the Cauvery-Mettur Project area; it takes into account the plentiful supply of water from the artesian wells which will be available all the year round and which will enable the ryots to grow at least one short-term foodcrop in addition to paddy.

“(c) No representation to reduce the water cess has been received from anybody in Cuddalore taluk.”

SRI M. LAKSHMANASWAMI :—“தாதுவுகிண்ட ஓக்கி-கல்-காவி-கிண்ட எந்தவாறு சாதுவாதுகிண்ட தெரியுமா ?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“I may tell the hon. Member that I have not got the figures as regards the number of acres which each well irrigates, but I have got figures to show that all the 20 wells which were sanctioned in 1948 would irrigate and that all the wells sanctioned in 1950 also would irrigate. As regards the 20 wells sanctioned in 1948, they are expected to irrigate an area of 1,570 acres, and in July 1950 about 101 artesian wells were sanctioned and they are expected to irrigate an area of 5,200 acres.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“Is it a fact that the number of existing artesian wells exceeds the requisite number and that, therefore, the quantity of water is gradually diminishing?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“Notice, Sir.”

Nellore Thermal Station.

* 236 Q.—SRI K. SHUNMUGHAM (on behalf of Sri D. Dasaratharamiah) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the thermal station at Nellore is self-sufficient financially;

[3rd December 1952]

(b) how many electrical connections were given for agricultural purposes and how many applications are still pending; and

(c) whether it is a fact that the truck-line at Vijayavada Thermal Station was removed and if so, where it was sent?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“(a) The answer is in the negative. The Thermal Station is expected to become remunerative in the tenth year of operation (1959-60).

“(b) Up to 1st October 1952, supply was given to seven consumers for agricultural purposes and 840 applications were pending.

“(c) The answer is in the negative.”

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASAMI :—“May I know the working cost of the Nellore Thermal Station and the sale price per unit?”

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—“The cost price per unit at the Nellore Thermal Station is six annas and a war cost surcharge of 40 per cent is levied on the above rate.”

SRI T. ANANTHA PAI :—“What is the reason for allowing lower rates to be charged at the Nellore Thermal Station while other Thermal Stations like the one at Udipi are allowed to charge a higher rate?”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member may give notice of a separate question.”

Zamindari forests taken over by the Forest department.

* 237 Q.—SRI P. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether Order No. 23560/51-52, dated 27th November 1951, issued by the Chief Conservator of Forests in respect of the policy to be adopted in the case of zamindari forests taken over by the Forest department is still in force;

(b) if it is in force, whether the order has been communicated to subordinates; and

(c) if the order is not in force, what policy is being followed now?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) & (b) Yes, Sir.

“(c) Does not arise.”

SRI P. RAMA RAO :—“ఈ forest officers గ్రామాలలో orders మంతు అందలేదని చెప్పి జమీందారీ areas లో ఉన్న టువంటి అన్ని forest ను గూడ reserve forest గా చేర్చి పుల్లరి వస్తూలు చేయవలసిందిగా ప్రాంతంలో గూడ పుల్లరి వస్తూలు చేస్తున్నారనే విషయము ప్రభుత్వమునకు తెలుసునా?”

3rd December 1952]

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ There were some representations about this some time ago. Now all the officers and rangers have been instructed to act according to the circular.”

SRI K. GOVINDA RAO :—“ ಈ ಜಿಲ್ಲೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರಂ ರైತುಳು ಸಂಕ್ರಮಿಂಪವಲಿಸಿಣುಮಂಜಿ ಸಾಂಪ್ರದಾಯಿಕ ಕುಕ್ಕುಲು ಭಕ್ಷ್ಯ ಪರುಪಬದುತುನ್ಮಾಯಿನ ದಾಸಿಪైన ವಿಮುನ representations ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವಮುನಕು ಕೆರಿನಾಯಾ ? ವಾಟಪైన ವಿಮಿ ಕೆಯಿಡುತುನ್ಮರು ? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ All the representations are being investigated and suitable action will be taken.”

SRI M. KUNE RAO :—“ ಈ ಜಮಿಂದಾರಿ ಆಡಳಿತು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಮುಕೆಸು ಲೋಕ. ಘಾಂತ್ಯಮು ರೈತುಳುಕು ಹಿಂದೆ ಕುಕ್ಕುಲು ವಾಟಿನ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನಮು ಕೆಸುಕ್ಕೊಸ್ಕರಿಕರುವಾಳ ಆಧಿಕಾರುಲಕೆತ ಹೆಲ್ಲಂಘಂಪದುತುನ್ಮಾಯಿನೆ ವಿಷಯಮು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಾರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸುನಾ ? ದಿನಿ ವಿಷಯಮು ವಿಮುನ ರಾಯವಾರಾಲು ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಾರಿಡಗ್ಗರಕು ವಚ್ಚಾಯಾ ? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ It is because of that thing that this Government Order has been issued, and whenever representations have been received by the Government, proper instructions have been given to the various officers and rangers to see that the Government Order is acted upon.”

Price of paddy given to jannmis in Malabar.

* 238 Q.—**SRI K. P. GOPALAN :** Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have fixed the price of paddy to be given as waram to jannmis by the peasants in Malabar; and if so, at what rate?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ No. Under sub-section (1) of section 51 of the Malabar Tenancy Act, the Collector of the district has to publish every month in the District Gazette, the current market price of paddy, etc., at the headquarters of each taluk and under sub-section (2) of that section, where the rent or michavaram, payable in kind is to be paid in money, the paddy, etc., should be valued for the purpose of determining the sum due, at the market price at the taluk headquarters last published under sub-section (1).”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“ As jannmis are collecting rents at arbitrary rates and as so many disputes have arisen over this matter, will the Government expedite the matter and instruct the Collector of Malabar to fix the waram rate? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The market rate is fixed and published in the Gazette and some time is allowed for the villagers and others to object to the price fixed, and once the price is fixed, commutation is worked out at that rate.”

SRI K. MADHAVAN NAMBIAR :—“ May I know whether the Government will advise the Collector of Malabar to take immediate steps to fix the price? ”

[3rd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" The Collector takes into consideration the conditions and figures of the price prevailing and then only he publishes the price in the Gazette."

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—" In view of the fact that the District Magistrate of Kozhikode did not publish the rate which he should have done according to the answer given by the Hon. Minister here, will the Government be pleased to take necessary action to see that the exorbitant amounts already received by the landowners, consequent upon the price of paddy to be given as waram not having been published under the Malabar Tenancy Act, are returned to the peasants concerned? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Let me have some time to verify the statement of the hon. Member."

High Level Kattalai Canal.

* 239 Q.—SRI S. RAMALINGAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state—

(a) whether the plans and estimates are ready for the scheme called " Mayanoor-Vallam High Level Kattalai Canal ";

(b) what is the area which can be brought under cultivation under this scheme; and

(c) what is the estimated cost of the scheme?

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" (a) Yes.

" (b) 24,650 acres.

" (c) Rs. 119 lakhs."

SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" Will the Hon. Minister be pleased to state whether there is any proposal to execute the scheme immediately? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" This has been deferred for the present in view of the financial stringency and in view of the doubts about the availability of supplies for new schemes in the Cauvery region."

10-50 a. m. SRI S. RAMALINGAM :—" In view of the failure of monsoon in that area for the last four or five years, may I know whether the Government will take steps to execute this scheme immediately and thus afford some relief to the ryots of that area? "

THE HON. SRI N. RANGA REDDI :—" It is for that very reason we have to postpone the execution of that scheme, especially as we are not getting adequate supply."

Instructions regarding Co-operative department employees to be members of co-operative societies.

* 240 Q.—SRI K. KRISHNA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state whether the Registrar of Co-operative Societies instructed all departmental employees to cease to be members of any co-operative society?

3rd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" According to the Government Servants Conduct Rules, Government servants employed in the Co-operative department are entitled to become members only in Co-operative Credit Societies registered exclusively for their benefit and in stores societies, housing societies and in the South India Co-operative Insurance Society. They can be members of primary land mortgage banks with the prior sanction of the Registrar. But they are prohibited from holding any office in any society except in a society registered exclusively for their benefit. Under the Government Servants Conduct Rules, Co-operative Sub-Registrars are prohibited to become members of even local Co-operative staff societies in the districts. The provisions of the rules are strictly enforced by the Registrar of Co-operative Societies. The Registrar of Co-operative Societies has also issued a circular instructing the subordinates not to buy articles on credit from any co-operative societies other than those intended for them."

DR. K. B. MENON :—" May I know whether the Registrar has any right to prevent anybody from becoming a member of any society and in the second place, is it not better and in the interests of the co-operative movement to allow the workers to become members of the societies? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Nobody is prevented from becoming a member of a co-operative society, excepting that the Directors of a Society have a certain amount of discretion in allowing a particular individual into their society."

SRI K. KRISHNA RAO :— ఆసథికార సహకారోద్యోగులు వారికి ప్రత్యేకముగా ఏర్పడినటువంటి సంఘములలో చేరకూడదని ఇటీవల రిజిస్ట్రార్ ఉత్తరువులు పంపించారు, నిజమేనా ? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" లేదండీ."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Is it not a fact that the present Registrar of Co-operative Societies happens to be a Director of the Madras Marketing Co-operative Society and do the Government Servants Conduct Rules not apply to him also? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" I do not know whether this contravenes the provisions of the Conduct Rules."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Perhaps he is there as an *ex officio* Director."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Let the Hon. Minister say so."

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" There seems to be some statutory provision also."

[3rd December 1952]

Assignment of lands to the poor.

* 241 Q.—SRI G. RAMA RAO : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether G.O. No. 1523, Revenue, regarding assignment of lands to the poor is in force now; and

(b) if so, what action the Government have so far taken to evict the landlords from the possession of Government assessed or unassessed lands under the above Government Order and what is the total extent so secured and granted to the landless poor in the State?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“(a) The hon. Member is referred to my answer on 6th November 1952 to question No. 80.

“(b) The Government have not issued any general instructions to the effect that all rich persons be evicted from the Government lands under their occupation. In cases where either a landless poor person or an ex-serviceman or a political sufferer, who is eligible for land grant under the revised orders, applies for any land under the occupation of a rich person, then the Collector will examine the relative claims of each and take steps to evict the encroacher if need be and grant the land to the applicant. The statistics asked for are not available.”

SRI G. RAMA RAO :—“ఈ 1523 సంబంధ G.O. లో 5 ఏకరాలకుపై నున్న ఖాస్వాములను తొలగించాలని ఉన్నది. కాని, ఇప్పటికి 5, 6 సంవత్సరాలయినప్పటికీ, దీనిపై కారం ఖాస్వాములను తొలగించి వేదవారికి ఆ ఖాస్వాములను ఇవ్వలేదు. ఇంతే కాకుండా 1952-వ సం॥ జూలై 7-వ తేదీగల ఇంకొక క్రొత్తగా 1957 సంబంధ, కొత్త G.O. ను వేస్తూ దానితో ముందు G.O. ను supersede చేస్తూ, వేదవారికి గవర్నమెంటు ఖాస్వాములు ఉచితంగా ఇవ్వరాదని, వాటిని market rate కు ఇవ్వాలని అందులో చెప్పబడింది. మొదట G.O. ను ఆ ప్రకారంగా issue చేసి, తరువాత దానికి contradictory గా ఎందుకు ఈ కొత్త G.O. ను వేశారని అడుగుతున్నాను ?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“I cannot understand the figures in Telugu. I want notice, Sir.”

SRI B. SANKARAYYA :—“గ్రామాలలో వేదవారికి ఖాస్వాముల నుండి ఈ ఖాస్వాములను ఇప్పించే విషయములో అక్కడి బిల్లా ఫుల్ డివైజన్లు ప్రభుత్వం నుండి మాకు యిట్టి సూచనలు రాలేదంటున్నారు. కనుక మెంటే ప్రభుత్వంవారు గ్రామాలలో సరిగా అమలు జరుకుమని సూచనలు పంపుతారా ?”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“The old Government Order is repealed. According to the new Government Order, the landless poor have got first priority. If the hon. Member brings to my notice any specific cases where it has not been adhered to, I shall examine them.”

3rd December 1952]

SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—“ బీద ప్రజలు భూములను ఆక్రమించుకొని పంటలు పండించుచుండగా, వారిమీద వికరీతమైన penalties వేస్తున్నారు. వారికి పట్టాలు ఇవ్వడంలేదనే సమస్య ఆలోచించి, వారికి తగిన పట్టాలు ఇచ్చి, ఈ penalties రద్దు చేయడానికి ప్రభుత్వ మేమైనా పూనుకొంటుందా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I want notice, Sir.”

SRI PRAGADA KOTAIAH :—“ May I know, Sir, whether the Government propose to collect information regarding the extent of land lying waste in each district and take immediate steps for speedy assignment of those lands to landless poor and thus avoid clashes arising in their attempts to occupy the waste lands? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The Government have already an idea of the waste lands available.”

SRI G. BAPANAYYA :—“ 1523 G.O. కును 1957 G.O. కును contradiction ఎందుకు వచ్చినచో తమరు నెలవిస్తారా? ముందు G.O. లో వేద వారికి ఉచితంగా భూములు ఇవ్వాలని చెప్పినూ, తరువాత G.O. లో ఉచితంగా భూములు ఇవ్వకూడదు. మార్కెట్ value కు ఇవ్వాలి అని ముందు G.O. కు contradictory గా ఉత్తరువు ఇవ్వడం ఎందుకు జరిగిందో నెలవియ్యగలరా? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ If I understand the question aright, I may inform the hon. Member that priority is given to the landless poor, but with regard to any lands available in towns, market value is demanded.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ ప్రభుత్వము బంజరు భూములను ఎవరికి ఇవ్వాలనే విషయంలో ఒక నిష్కర్షకమైన పద్ధతి అవలంబించక పోయినందున గ్రామాలలో ఎక్కడ riotings దానికి తగినట్లుగా ప్రజలమీద ఒత్తులు వస్తున్నాయి అనేటటువంటి విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము గమనించి, ఇప్పుడైనా ఈ బంజరు భూములను రైతులకు, వ్యవసాయ కూలీలకు పంచివెట్టే పద్ధతి ఏదైనా ఆలోచిస్తుందా? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The first part of the question referred to by the hon. Member belongs to ancient history. Now there is no such trouble. We are trying as far as possible to obviate the trouble and assign lands according to the present rules.”

SRI B. APPALASWAMI :—“ 73 సంవత్సరాలుగా చాలా కృషిచేసి కాగు చేసినటువంటి భూములను రాజకీయ వాధితులకు ఇచ్చారు. అది చాలా అన్యాయమైనటువంటిదని ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించి ఇప్పుడైనా వాటిని వేదవారికి ఇస్తారా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Wherever it is legally possible, we do it. But if the transaction had already been completed, we cannot interfere and we cannot do anything.”

[3rd December 1952]

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ Supposing a Harijan, an ex-serviceman and an ex-tapper, who are also landless poor, apply for the same land and at the same time, may I know who will get priority? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is a hypothetical question.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The Hon. Minister was pleased to say that the Government have got complete details about the extent of banjar lands, cultivable waste lands available in the State. May I know whether the Government have any general scheme with regard to the assignment of these lands excepting the mere consideration of individual cases? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ The scheme is this. In certain places co-operative societies are encouraged to take lands and cultivate them on a co-operative basis. In other cases, lands are given to individuals.”

SRI V. SRI KRISHNA :—“ On a point of order, Sir, ఈ 1951 న సంబంధించి 1952 వ సం॥ జూలై 7 వ తేదీన G.O. లో single crop wet lands నూతన valuable lands క్రిందకు వస్తాయనీ ఆ భూములను అమ్మవచ్చునని South Kanara జిల్లా రివెయ్యంట్ల పంపిన సందర్భంగా యిచ్చారు. దాన్ని మంత్రిగారు కాదంటున్నారు. వారి ఈ information నేరే అయిందికాదని వారి అభిప్రాయాన్ని మార్చుకోవలసిందని చెప్పుచున్నాను.”

11 a.m. MR. SPEAKER :—“ I want to know what the hon. Member says in Telugu.”

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—“ He alleges that the Minister is giving wrong information.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ It is no point of order at all.”

Supersession of the Central Co-operative Bank, Srikakulam.

* 242 Q.—SRI G. LATCHANNA: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the term of supersession of the Central Co-operative Bank, Limited, Srikakulam, has been extended to one more year;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor;

(c) what are the dates on which the last presidential election was conducted, the Co-operative Bank was superseded and the term of supersession was extended to a further period of one year, respectively;

(d) whether any representation was made to the Government for the reconstitution of the Bank or for the appointment of an Advisory Board; and

(e) if so, the action taken so far?

3rd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“(a) It is a fact that the period of supersession of the Board of Management of the Srikakulam Co-operative Central Bank was extended for a further period of one year from 1st August 1952.

“(b) The period of supersession of the Committee of the Central Bank was extended chiefly for the following two reasons:

(1) vigorous action was called for to collect the overdues and arrest their growth.

(2) time was not opportune to hold a meeting of the general body for the election of Directors.

“(c) The last presidential election was conducted on 24th December 1949. The Committee of the Bank was superseded for a period of one year from 1st February 1951. The period was extended for six months from 1st February 1952. It was last extended for a further period of one year from 1st August 1952.

“(d) A representation was received by the Registrar from Sri Lakshmanaswamy and two others for the constitution of an Advisory Committee and for the restoration of the normal constitution of the Bank after a period of six months. Another representation has been received by the Government from Sri B. Rajagopala Rao, Member of the House of the People, for restoring the normal constitution of the Bank by holding the elections as soon as possible.”

“(e) An Advisory Committee was appointed to advise the Special Officer of the Central Bank in carrying on the administration of the Bank. The representation from Sri B. Rajagopala Rao is under consideration.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“May I know the amount of overdues at the time of the supersession that was first ordered and at the time of the last extension of the period of supersession?”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“I would like to have notice, Sir.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“May I know whether it is a fact that the Registrar, in reply to a letter from one Rajagopal Naidu, said that in Srikakulam, no one was found to be able to administer the affairs of the Central Co-operative Bank? If so, may I expect that elections will be ordered within one month or so?”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“With regard to the letter purported to have been written by the Registrar to one Rajagopal Naidu, I have no knowledge. But with regard to the question of conducting elections, I am more anxious to do so than the hon. Member.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“I heard the Hon. the Minister say that the time was not opportune to conduct elections. What are the grounds for holding this view? If he thinks the time is

[3rd December 1952]

inopportune, I would like to know whether it is on grounds connected with the co-operative movement or on extraneous considerations?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" The considerations relate to the co-operative movement."

SRI L. LAKSHMANA DAS :—" In view of the fact that the business of the Co-operative Central Bank has fallen from sixty to fifteen lakhs during the official regime, will the Government take steps for the conduct of elections at a very early date?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" With regard to the business of the bank falling from sixty lakhs to fifty lakhs, I am not sure of the position. As regards the second part of the question, I have already made it clear that I am very anxious to have elections soon."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" In view of the fact that the Hon. the Minister is saying that he is anxious to have elections soon, may I know when he proposes to see that elections take place and the normal life of the institutions restored?"

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" Very soon."

Government claim to Kanur lanka in West Godavari.

* 243 Q.—SRI G. SATYANARAYANA : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether the Government have laid a claim to the Kanur lanka in Kovvur taluk, West Godavari district, under the Estates Abolition Act, 1948?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—

" (1) Kanur lanka is in Tanuku taluk, West Godavari district and not in Kovvur taluk of that district.

" (2) The Government had claimed the lanka as their own just as any other lanka and not under the provisions of the Madras Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948 which has been held as not applicable to the lanka as it did not form part of Elamarru estate. It has since been brought to the notice of the Government that the District Judge, West Godavari decided in O.P. No. 143 of 1947 that the lanka belonged to the Zamindarini of Elamarru."

SRI G. SATYANARAYANA :—" ప్రస్తుతం ఈ భూములు ఎవ్వరి స్వాధీనంలో ఉన్నాయి చెబుతారా ? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—
" Notice. Sir."

SRI P. RAMACHANDRA RAO :—" ఈ లంకలకు సంబంధించినటువంటి

(1) G.O. Ms. No. 406, dated 19th February 1951.

(2) Revenue Board No. S.E.F.-2-2329/51.

(3) G.O. No. 4872/E.W./51.

అను సభ్యులకు అందజేస్తారా? "

3rd December 1952]

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ If figures are mentioned in Telugu, I cannot answer the question at all.”

SRI G. SATYANARAYANA :—“ ఈ భూములు చాలా కాలంగా ఆ గ్రామ వాస్తవ్యులు సాగు చేసుకొనుటకు, కనీసం వార్షిక lease ఇప్పించటానికి, గవర్నమెంటు ప్రయత్నం చేస్తుందా ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I said, Sir, that a decision of the Court, said that the estate belonged to the zamindarini.”

Alleged failure of crops in Malabar.

* 244 Q.—SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether any reports have been received about the failure of crops on single crop lands in Malabar; and

(b) if so, whether the Government will be pleased to issue orders remitting the land revenue for the areas where crops have failed?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ (a) The Collector has reported that rainfall is not quite adequate in Palghat and in parts of Walluvanad taluks, but that no appreciable difficulty is likely to be caused unless there are no showers at all during the next one and a half months.

“ (b) The Collector is watching the situation and remission of land revenue will be granted wherever necessary.”

SRI K. C. GOPALAN UNNI :—“ When was the report of the Collector received ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Some time back, Sir.”

SRI R. KRISHNAN :—“ May I know whether there is any law which gives protection to the tenant from indebtedness and from payment of waram even when his crops fail due to drought ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I was hearing the term ‘ waram ’ during discussions of the Tenancy Bill. I do not know how it comes in here when the question is about revision of ownership.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“ The Hon. the Minister was pleased to state that the Government would be kind enough to consider the question of remission wherever necessary. In view of the fact that the real occupants of lands are peasants and that these peasants as per contract previously entered into, are compelled to pay the waram in full, although the crops have completely failed, will the Government be pleased to consider some steps to see that these peasants are given remission in proportion to the amount given as remission to the landlords ? ”

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ I think certain legal aspects are involved in the question. I have to consider them.”

[3rd December 1952]

Complaints against local forest officials in Cuddapah district.

* 245 Q.—SRI T. VISWANATHAM: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether a representation, dated 8th August 1952, from the villagers of Mittaneedipalle, Cuddapah district, was received by the Government complaining about the 'atrocities' of local forest officials; and

(b) if so, what action has been taken?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) & (b) A copy of a petition, dated 8th August 1952, addressed to the District Forest Officer, Cuddapah South Division, was received by the Government. It has been ascertained that the District Forest Officer, Cuddapah South Division, who received the original petition, enquired into the allegations contained in the petition and has come to the conclusion that the petition has been the outcome of detection of a forest offence in which some of the signatories to the petition were involved. No action was taken by Government.”

11-10
a.m.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Sir, the Hon. Minister said that the allegations contained in the petitions were enquired into. What were the allegations that were enquired into and what were the allegations that were not enquired into?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Sir, the allegations were that when the petitioners were driving their cattle home after grazing them in the forest, the forest guards and others wanted to drive the cattle into the pound. The other allegation was, the day after that, during the enquiry, these petitioners were beaten by the policemen, and the policemen and the guards were drunk. All the allegations were enquired into and found to be incorrect.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Sir, is the Hon. Minister aware that this is a kind of allegation which is not peculiar to the particular place but similar things are happening . . .”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“Similar allegations are made . . .”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Not allegations, but similar things are happening throughout the State. Will the Hon. Minister issue instructions to see that these things do not happen and also see that the forest guards do not violate the laws of the Government themselves, by drinking too much.” (Laughter.)

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“Sir, indeed the Government are anxious to see that the rules framed by the Government are obeyed by the servants of the Government.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ఈ allegations ను enquire చేశారని తెలుసుకున్నారు. ఎవరు enquire చేశారు. ప్రజల సాక్ష్యం తీసుకున్నారా? లేకపోతే departmental enquiry తో పూర్తి పందా రా ?”

3rd December 1952]

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" The allegation was that the policemen and the forest guards were drunk. On hearing that, the Superintendent of Police asked the Circle Inspector of Police to take all the people on the very same day to the District Medical Officer to see whether they were drunk. On examination, it was found that they were not drunk."

SRI R. SIDDANNA GOWD :—" ఉట్టి complaints ను నివారించడానికి తగ్గించడానికి రైతుల మధ్య, ఫారెస్టు ఉద్యోగుల మధ్య రైసా కమిటీని ఏర్పాటు చేయడలవాడా ? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" It will be considered, Sir."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" Allegations ఎప్పుడు చేశారయి ? వాటిని ఎప్పుడు enquire చేశారు ? విచారణ జరిగిన ఎన్ని గంటలకు వారిని డాక్టరు వద్దకు తీసుకొనివచ్చారు ? ఎన్ని గంటలకు డాక్టరు వారిని తరిక్షించి ప్రారణచేసారు ? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" I cannot give exactly the hour when these things took place. When the enquiry was going on, a complaint was made to the Superintendent of Police and he sent the policemen and the forest guards with the Circle Inspector of Police to the District Medical Officer, to find out whether they were drunk. The very same day, before nightfall, the District Medical Officer examined these people and found that they were not drunk."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, the Hon. Minister was pleased to say that the men against whom the allegations were made, were examined by the District Medical Officer and found that they were not drunk. When was the allegation made that they were drunk? Was there a long interval between the time when the allegation was made and their actual examination and on what basis did the Medical Officer come to the conclusion that they were not drunk even though it might have taken a long time for the actual examination? "

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—" On the same day while the enquiry was going on, the Circle Inspector was sent for and asked to take these people to the District Medical Officer, for examination. How the Medical Officer came to the conclusion that the people were not drunk, I think the hon. Member must address that question to the Medical Officer. The hon. Member seems to know better about it than myself."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" May I add, Sir, that the suggestion of the interpellating hon. Member is that we should always assume that people were drunk as soon as the allegation is made."

[3rd December 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Without assuming anything, Sir, unless there is reasonable basis, may I ask, whether the Hon. Minister can tell me how long will the effects of drunkenness be on the man.” (Laughter.)

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The question again is an elementary proposition as to the burden of proof. When it is charged that any man is out of order in his behaviour, the burden of proof is on those who allege, and if you are not able to produce evidence, it does not mean that we should presume that the allegation is true.”

American ‘ Hallet ’ Pumpsets.

* 246 Q.—SRI M. MUNI REDDI : Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) how many American “ Hallet ” pumpsets were purchased in the years 1948-49, 1949-50, 1950-51 and 1951-52 and from whom;

(b) whether they were purchased with the necessary spare parts;

(c) whether the importers have the necessary original and genuine spare parts for the pumpsets supplied to the Government;

(d) how many engines are in working order; how many are condemned; and what is the life of the engine supplied when compared to other makes available in the market; and

(e) how many Petter Kirloskar sets were purchased and what is the cost of each set?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ (a) One-hundred and six numbers of American “ Hallet ” engines (96 numbers of 8-h.p. units and 10 of 18-h.p. units) were purchased by the Agricultural department in the year 1949-50 for hiring to ryots. There were no purchases of this make either previous or subsequent to this.

“ (b) No.

“ (c) Yes.

“ (d) No. As the repairs to the engines are carried out in the mufassal then and there when they fall into disrepair, it is not possible to give the number of engines in working order at any time. No engine has so far been condemned. The life of these engines is eight years as in the case of other makes.

“ (e) Fifty (50) numbers of AV. 2 Petter/Kirloskar sets of 6-h.p. were acquired during 1950-51 for hiring out to ryots, at a cost of Rs. 2,620 each exclusive of sales tax.”

Housing Scheme at Madanapalle.

* 247 Q.—SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH : Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Housing Scheme at Madanapalle was taken up by the Co-operative department;

3rd December 1952]

(b) at what stage it is to-day; and

(c) what steps the Government propose to take in the matter?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“(a) The Madanapalle Co-operative Building Society has undertaken the Government-sponsored Housing Scheme at Madanapalle.”

“(b) An extent of 33.61 acres of land has been acquired and handed over to the society. The land has been laid out into 165 plots; 96 plots have so far been allotted to the members and the rest are pending allotment. The society has got approved 20 type designs of houses and has worked out the necessary estimates. Construction of 12 wells had been completed and foundations have been excavated in respect of six houses. Loan applications are under preparation.”

“(c) No action by Government is called for in the present stage of the affairs of the society.”

SRI D. SEETHARAMIAH :—“ఇప్పుడు మదనపల్లిలో రెండు వేలమంది చేతిపనివారు ఆనగా బేలుదార్లు, కొయ్య పనివారు వసులు లేక నిరుద్యోగులై పస్తులు పండుకొంటున్నారు కాబట్టి, ప్రభుత్వం అన్ని గృహములయొక్క నిర్మాణం ఒకడపాలో వెంటనే శాంక్షన్ (sanction) చేస్తుందా? కరువుకాటకాలలో బాధపడుతున్న వై వారికి పని కల్పించే నిమిత్తం ఈ విషయమై శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొంటుందా?”

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—“కరువుచేత నిరుద్యోగులైన బాధ పడుతున్న వారికి పనులు కల్పించే నిమిత్తం ఈ గృహ నిర్మాణ ప్రణాళిక ఉదే శంకుబడలేదు. వారికి పని కల్పించే నిమిత్తం అనేక ప్రణాళిక లున్నాయి.”

Collection of house tax by panchayat boards.

* 248 Q.—SRI K. P. GOPALAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state what are the reasons which prompted the Government to authorize panchayat boards to levy a new tax called house tax in panchayat board areas in this State?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“The attention of the hon. Member is invited to section 63 of the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1950, under which the levy of house-tax, amongst others, by panchayats is obligatory.”

SRI K. P. GOPALAN :—“Sir, in view of the fact that people are overburdened with so many taxes and there is so much unemployment in the country, will the Government be pleased to withdraw these new taxes?”

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“The house tax is the main source of revenue for the panchayats. If they are to do some work and improve the villages, they have to tax the people there.”

SRI C. H. KANARAN :—“Sir, may I know, whether the Government have received any memorandum from the people in

[3rd December 1952]

the panchayat area stating that the taxes are too heavy for them to pay and therefore these taxes should either be cancelled or reduced at least? "

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" Sir, the rates are fixed by the panchayat board itself. So the question of heaviness does not come in."

11-20 a.m. JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—" May I know whether the Government propose to exempt distressed weavers and unemployed weavers from the payment of house-tax? "

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" Wherever there is distress, I think deserving weavers are being exempted from the payment of house-tax."

SRI K. V. RAMESAM :—" Will the Government at least exempt for one year those panchayats which are not willing to impose the house-tax on their inhabitants? "

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—" I think it is open to the legislature to do it."

Pudukkottai Land Mortgage Bank.

* 249 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Co-operation be pleased to state when the Pudukkottai Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank was formed in Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district?

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" The Pudukkottai Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank was registered on 11th April 1950 and started on 10th June 1950."

SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN :—" Is the governing body of the bank elected or nominated and if nominated, why? "

THE HON. SRI D. SANJIVAYYA :—" It is a nominated body, Sir."

Glass Bead Training Centres.

* 250 Q.—JANAB M. S. MOGRAL: Will the Hon. the Minister for Rural Welfare be pleased to state—

(a) how many Glass Beads Training Centres are conducted by the Government in this State;

(b) how many students were trained at these centres centre-war each year ever since their inception;

(c) how many students are undergoing training at Kasargod centre during the current year; and

(d) what is the annual expenditure on each centre?

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—" (a) Two Glass Bangles and Beads Training centres are being conducted by the Department of Industries and Commerce—one at Kalahasti (Chittoor district) and the other at Kasargod (South Kanara district).

3rd December 1952]

“(b) The number of artisans trained at the two Glass Bangles and Bead Training centres are—

Year.	Kalahasti Centre (started in 1947-48).	Kasaragod Centre (started in 1950-51).
(1)	(2)	(3)
1947-48	14	..
1948-49	14	..
1949-50	15	..
1950-51	14	7
1951-52	15	12

“(c) At Kasaragod 12 candidates are now undergoing training.

“(d) The annual expenditure of each of the centres at Kalahasti and Kasaragod is Rs. 26,000.”

JANAB M. S. MOGRAL :—“ May I know whether the Government propose to give financial or other aids to trained students who intend starting glass beading industries independently? ”

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—“ This institute is specifically intended to give training to students in glass beading industry. I do not know why the students need any separate financial aid.”

SRI L. C. PAIS :—“ How many of the trainees have been able to secure employment after training, Sir? ”

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—“ I want notice to give the exact figures, Sir.”

SRI S. NARAYANAPPA :—“ I want to know whether any Backward community students have been admitted to this training course? ”

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—“ I suppose there must have been some students from the backward communities also. If the hon. Member wants exact figures, I want notice to furnish the same.”

SRI T. N. VENKATASUBBA REDDI :—“ I want to know whether there is any truth in the recent report that the Kalahasti glass beading industry is to be shifted to some other place and may I know also whether it is not necessary that the special board which has been set up to look into the industrial needs of the Rayalaseema area should have been consulted in the matter? ”

THE HON. SRI S. B. P. PATTABHI RAMA RAO :—“ There is no proposal at present to shift the training centre, Sir.”

Shifting of Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory from Kodur in Cuddapah district.

* 251 Q.—SRI P. NARASIMHA REDDI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government propose to transfer a portion of the Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory attached to the Government Fruit Canning Factory from Kodur (Cuddapah district) to Madras City;

[3rd December 1952]

(b) if so, for what reasons; and

(c) whether the Bio-Chemist made any representations to the Government to transfer it to Madras?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) & (b) The Government issued orders transferring the research part of the Bio-Chemist's section from Kodur to Madras as the latter is more centrally situated and offers better research facilities. But subsequently, as it was represented to the Government that the transfer of the Bio-Chemist's section from Kodur to Madras is not desirable, the Director of Agriculture was asked not to give effect to the orders of the Government but to await further orders in the matter.

“(c) The answer is in the negative.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ఇంతకుముందు ఒక దఫా, కోడూరునుంచి Fruit specialist ను, Agricultural school ను కోయండ్లూరు జిల్లాకు మార్చి వేసిన సంగతి జా వకముంచుకొని ఇకనుంచైనా కోడూరులో ఉన్న శాఖను మార్చకుండా ఉంచుటకు ప్రయత్నిస్తారా?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“I am not aware of the previous orders of the Government trying to shift the fruit station from Kodur, to which the hon. Member had just now referred. It is not a question of removing either the fruit canning station or the entire research station. The reference is only to the bio-chemistry section of the research station which was proposed to be shifted sometime ago.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Is the Hon. Minister aware of the fact that there are more than 110 varieties of mangoes and more than 96 varieties of citrus and in view of the fact that there are also more than 3,000 acres of land in Rajampet taluk alone growing oranges, will the Hon. Minister issue necessary orders not to shift the fruit station from Kodur to Madras?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“In view of the representations that have been made by the Members of the Assembly coming from Rayalaseema, the Government have asked for further reports from the Director of Agriculture after visiting the laboratories in Kodur station.”

SRI K. KOTI REDDI :—“May I ask the Hon. Minister whether it is not desirable that the canning section as well as the research section should be in one and the same place?”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“The difficulty is that we do not have the facilities necessary for a laboratory at Kodur. The bio-chemistry research laboratory is a very complicated matter and the University of Madras has been kind enough to give us facilities to run a bio-chemistry section here. Moreover the bio-chemistry section in Kodur has been working there for nearly a decade from 1942 onwards. Not much tangible work had been turned out by them. Moreover it would take a long time for us to have a complete bio-chemistry laboratory at Kodur.”

3rd December 1952]

SRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH :—“ May I know whether it is not a fact that the previous Minister for Agriculture, Mr. Madhava Menon visited the research station at Kodur and after hearing representations from the agriculturists of Rayalaseema passed definite orders not to shift the research laboratory from Kodur? If that is a fact, may I know the reasons why this present Government have annulled what the previous Minister had done? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Not much research work had been done at the Kodur research station. It was only with the specific idea of carrying on more intensive research in the bio-chemistry section that it was previously proposed to shift the bio-chemistry section to the City.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ May I know what are those facilities which the Government have not been able to provide but which the Madras University was able to provide for the research station at Kodur? Are the Government not able to stand by themselves without any aid from the University, Sir? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ We do not have a laboratory building at all in Kodur, Sir.”

SRI G. LATCHANNA :—“ May I know, Sir, for how many years the Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory has been working at Kodur, when the Government expect to receive the report from the Director of Agriculture and when a decision will be taken thereon by the Government? ” 11-30 a.m.

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ The Laboratory has been there for the last ten years and the work that has been done there has not been of great importance.”

SRI T. NAGI REDDI :—“ కోడూరు వండ్ల పరిశ్రమకు ప్రసిద్ధి చెందిన ప్రాంతమగుటచేత ఆక్కడ ఉన్న laboratory ని మద్రాసుకు మార్చకుండుటకు ప్రభుత్వంవారు ప్రయత్నిస్తారా? ఈ మార్పుని రాయలసీమ డెవలప్ మెంట్ బోర్డుకు తెలియపరచారా? ఆయిన్నట్లైతే ఆ బోర్డువారి అభిప్రాయమేమిటి? ఈ విషయమై ప్రసారాలోచించి కోడూరులోని ఫల పరిశ్రమకు సంబంధించిన ప్రభుత్వ సంస్థలను ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు మార్చకుండా ఉంటారా? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ The matter was discussed by the Rayalaseema Development Board at its meeting held on the 8th November 1952. They resolved not to press against the transfer of the Bio-Chemistry Research Laboratory attached to the Government Fruit Canning Factory, from Kodur to Madras City. It may please be noted that they resolved not to press against the transfer.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Are the Government correct in their information that the Rayalaseema Development Board resolved so? ”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“ Yes, Sir. I was myself the President of that meeting.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The answers to other questions on to-day's agenda will be printed in the proceedings.”

[3rd December 1952]

Reorganization of Municipal Administration.

* 252 Q.—SRI V. V. RAMASAMI: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state the decisions taken by the Government on the recommendations of the Committee constituted in G.O. Ms. No. 2313, L.A., dated 11th November 1949, in respect of the reorganization of the Municipal Administration in this State?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI:—“ Government are still considering the report of the Committee and it will take some time to arrive at decisions thereon.”

Grant of land to political sufferer in Unguturu Reserve Forest, West Godavari.

* 253 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state—

(a) whether it is a fact that the Government granted to political sufferer (Sri S. Bhagavannarayana of Bondada) an extent of 60 acres of forest in Unguturu Reserve Forest Block No. 2, in West Godavari district; and

(b) whether the same had been applied for by Harijans previously and had been refused?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ (a) An extent of 50 acres of forest land in Block No. 2, Unguturu Reserve Forest was granted in favour of Sri S. Bhagavannarayana on lease for kumri cultivation for a period of ten years.

“ (b) No such application had come to the notice of the Government then.”

Agricultural loans for Harijans and Harijan Christians.

* 254 Q.—SRI M. RAJESWARA RAO: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state the number of applications received by the Government from Harijan and Harijan Christian ryots for agricultural loans (under all Acts providing such loans) in West Godavari district and the amount of loans granted during the years 1946–51 and 1951–52?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—“ The particulars are not readily available. They have to be gathered and compiled for the district. The work will involve considerable time and labour and will not be commensurate with the purpose served. The loans are granted to all applicants who satisfy the conditions of the grant and no distinction is made with reference to the community to which the applicant may belong.”

3rd December 1952]

Agricultural farm in Pudukkottai Division.

* 255 Q.—SRI V. BALAKRISHNAN: Will the Hon. the Minister for Agriculture be pleased to state—

(a) the cost of running the agricultural farm in Pudukkottai Division, Tiruchirappalli district;

(b) the income to the farm by (1) sale of milk and (2) sale of vegetables; and

(c) the other activities of the farm, if any?

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“(a) The cost of running the agricultural farm in Pudukkottai since it was taken over by Animal Husbandry Department in June 1951 up to September 1952 is Rs. 56,469.

“(b) The income for the farm for the above period is by sale of :

(1) Milk—Rs. 6,742-1-9.

(2) Vegetables—Rs. 587-10-8.

“(c) The farm aims at the supply of good pedigree stud bulls to the ryots in the districts and also serves as a centre demonstrating the scientific breeding, feeding and proper management of cattle and cultivation and preservation of fodder. In addition to breeding work, the farm also runs a small-scale dairy. An artificial insemination centre has also been opened in the farm under the All-India Key Village Scheme of cattle improvement.”

Removal of the President of the Phirangipuram Panchayat.

* 256 Q.—SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH: Will the Hon. the Minister for Local Administration be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have ordered the removal of the President of the Phirangipuram Panchayat;

(b) if so, the date of the order; and whether it has been given effect to; and

(c) if not, why not?

THE HON. SRI N. SANKARA REDDI :—“(a) The order of removal was issued by the Inspector of Municipal Councils and Local Boards, by virtue of the powers vested in him under section 47 of the Madras Village Panchayats Act, 1950.

“(b) The date of the order is the 5th October 1952, but it was not given effect to.

“(c) On a writ petition filed by the President, the High Court of Madras has stayed the proceedings of the Inspector, pending further orders on the petition.”

[3rd December 1952]

Alleged application of the Rent Reduction Act in non-estate villages.

* 257 Q.—JANAB MAHOMED SALIH MARAIKAYAR: Will the Hon. the Minister for Land Revenue be pleased to state whether it is a fact that even in villages declared as non-estates, the Rent Reduction Act is being applied by Officers of Government?

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—“ Yes. There have been cases in which the Rent Reduction Act has been applied by mistake to villages which have been held by civil courts to be not estates governed by the Estates Land Act. Action is being taken to stop collection of rents under the Rent Reduction Act in such villages.”

[Note.—An asterisk (*) at the commencement of a speech indicates revision by the Member.]

II.—RULES GOVERNING ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I hope the House will remember that at the last sitting I told the House that I would circulate a note regarding rules governing adjournment motions. Holidays intervened and so I could not do it. I will have it circulated in a day or two.

“ In the meantime I have received a number of adjournment motions. In this connexion I wish to read what the famous Speaker of the House of Commons, Mr. Peel, said in regard to adjournment motions. He said : ‘ What I think was contemplated was the occurrence of some sudden emergency ’. That is the principle laid down by him. I sympathise with hon. Members here, because they have not got as many opportunities to discuss matters as the Members of Parliament have in England. Every day they have got a half-hour debate. I have sent a suggestion for such half-hour debates to the Members of the Rules Committee asking them to give their suggestions. So, when the House accepts the Rules, there will be greater opportunities for Members for debate. That apart, the House would probably be anxious to know the number of adjournment motions admitted in England.

Number of motions.

Session.	Number of motions.		
	Offered.	Refused by Speaker.	Allowed by Speaker.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1921 ..	11	3	8
1922 ..	14	10	4
1923 ..	13	11	2
1924 ..	7	5	2
1924-25 ..	6	6	0
1926 ..	10	10	0
1927 ..	1	1	0
1928 ..	5	3	2
1928-29 ..	1	1	0

3rd December 1952]

[Mr. Speaker]

Session.	Number of motions.		
	Offered.	Refused by Speaker.	Allowed by Speaker.
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
1929-30	7	4	3
1930-31	6	5	1
1931-32	6	6	0
1932-33	6	6	0
1933-34	4	3	1
1934-35	4	4	0
1935-36	3	2	1
1936-37	4	2	2
1937-38	2	0	2
1938-39	4	4	0
	114	86	28
Annual average	6.0	4.5	1.5

So, from 1921 to 1939 both years inclusive, 114 adjournment motions were offered, out of which 86 were refused and only 28 were admitted by the Speaker in England."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"After 1939 the gentlemen there stopped giving any adjournment motions, I think." (Laughter.)

MR. SPEAKER:—"So, on an average, six adjournment motions were offered every year and 4.5 were refused by the Speaker and only 1.5 allowed. But, I have been receiving in this House at least quarter dozen adjournment motions every day."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU:—"అధ్యక్షా, మీరు బ్రిటిష్ పార్లమెంటులో adjournment motions ను గురించి statistics 1921 నుంచి 1939 వరకు చూశారు. అందులో recent గా చెప్పినా, అంటే 1945 నుంచి 1952 సంవత్సరాల మధ్య dispose of అయినావనంటే ఏమైనా ఉంటే చెప్పండి."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member may speak in English at least to me." (Laughter.)

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"He wants to know the latest figures from 1945 to 1952."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, these figures are from the report of a Select Committee constituted to go into the rules and make new suggestions. Now, I will read out the adjournment motions."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"May I make a suggestion, Sir. If the Chair rules any adjournment motion out of order, it is not necessary to bring it to the notice of the House and ask the Members to explain it. Only in cases where there is likely to be some argument from the Members to convince you that it is in order, it need be placed before the House. Otherwise it will be regular waste of time, and perhaps the intention of

[Sri C. Subramaniam] [3rd December 1952]

the Member in giving notice of an adjournment motion is to get an opportunity to make a speech. I respectfully submit, therefore, that it is not necessary to bring all the adjournment motions to the notice of the House."

MR. SPEAKER :—" That is the procedure I used to follow hitherto. But at the request of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I am bringing them to the notice of the House."

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" In reply to what the Hon. the Leader of the House has said, I must say that I cannot agree with him. It is not for making a speech here, that we moved an adjournment motion, because we have lots of opportunities to make speeches. Therefore it is not because of a fatal temptation to make a speech that we give notice of adjournment motions. But as you are aware, the rules at present are not very clear. We have not been able to understand exactly what are out of order and what are in order. That is the reason why I have requested you, Sir, to read out these adjournment motions and tell us where we go wrong so that we may not repeat such mistakes. I think we can discuss these also in the Rules Committee and I am glad you have also suggested a half-hour debate every day. If that is done, it will minimize our difficulties. The smallness of the number of adjournment motions in England is due to the fact that there they have got greater opportunities to raise these matters in the daily half-hour debate. However, I would request you to take all these considerations into your mind and read out the adjournment motions and let us know where our motions are out of order."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Apart from that, in the half-hour debates there is no division at all; the matter is talked out."

III.—ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member Sri K. Vinayakam has given notice of the following adjournment motion :—

(1) *Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service Officer.*

" This House do stand adjourned to discuss an urgent matter of public importance regarding the grave allegations made by the hon'ble Mr. Sarangadhar Das, M.P., in the House of the People about corruption charges against an Indian Civil Service Officer belonging to the Madras State and to institute a Committee to enquire into those alleged corruption charges."

This is in regard to the allegations made by a Member in the House of the People against an I.C.S. Officer that he is corrupt and I do not know how it can be brought as an adjournment motion in this House."

11-40
m. SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" I think, Sir, the Hon. Minister for Commerce also stated in Parliament that the charges were pending investigation. So, it is not as if it was a mere allegation that was made."

MR. SPEAKER :—" But it is not urgent."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" That is another point, Sir."

3rd December 1952]

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is not as if I am trying to take an opportunity to speak in this House now, for, no day passes without a speech from me. I am now trying to make a *prima facie* case for allowing my adjournment motion. Sir, my adjournment motion reads thus :

' This House do stand adjourned to discuss an urgent matter of public importance regarding the grave allegations made by the hon. Mr. Sarangadhar Das, M.P., in the House of the People about corruption charges against an Indian Civil Service Officer belonging to the Madras State and to institute a Committee to enquire into those alleged corruption charges.'

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have been quoting from the"

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member must be brief; I will give him two minutes."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Ten minutes, Sir? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" No, only two minutes."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Sir, I have in my possession records to prove that the Member has alleged in the Central Parliament that the I.C.S. Officer against whom allegations of corruption have been made was shunted out to Madras and arrangements were being made to shield him."

(Sri C. Rajam Ramaswami rose to speak.)

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" I am not yielding, Sir. These allegations were made openly in the House, without anybody challenging him. If it is reasonably proved that the charges are true, it will affect the self-respect of this State administration, it will affect our self-respect; if the Hon. the Chief Minister has any respect for the Madras administration and for this House, I want him to take up the challenge from this side."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I rule this out of order. It is not an urgent matter. The allegation is pending before the Government."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" I have not spoken even for the two minutes you gave me, Sir."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I have given my ruling. I have ruled it out of order."

(2) *Havoc caused by the recent cyclone.*

MR. SPEAKER :—" Here is another adjournment motion given notice of by Mr. Palaniandi. It reads as follows :—

' This House do stand adjourned to discuss a definite urgent matter of public importance, namely, the vast extent of havoc caused by the cyclone in Tanjore and Tiruchi and other neighbouring places on the 30th November and 1st December 1952, and the necessity on the part of Government to take immediate ameliorative measures to relieve the distress of the people.' "

* SRI M. PALANIANDI :—" கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, 30-ம் தேதி அடித்த புயலின் காரணமாக ஏற்பட்டிருக்கக்கூடிய சேதங்களை யெல்லாம் நாம் பார்க்க வேண்டும். நமது முதன் மந்திரி ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் ஒரு அறிக்கை விடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். அதாவது இந்தப்

[Sri M. Palaniandi] [3rd December 1952]

புயலையும், மழையையும் உண்டு பண்ணிய கடவுளுக்கு நன்றி செலுத்துவோம் என்பதாக மழையையும் புயலையும் வரவேற்று இருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் எந்தப் புயலையும், மழையையும் கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் வரவேற்று இருக்கிறார்களோ அதனால் ஏற்பட்ட கோரத்தாக்குதலினால்தான் இன்றைய தினம் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லா, திருச்சி ஜில்லா, சேலம் ஜில்லா நாமக்கல் தாலுக்கா போன்ற இடங்களிலுள்ள பல்லாயிரக்கணக்கான ஏழைகள் வீடிழந்து இருக்கிறார்கள். தங்கும் இடமின்றி நடுத்தெருவில் ஆகாரத்திற்கு வசதியின்றி தவித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் நாம் விவசாய மக்களின் நலனைக்கருதியே சட்டம் வகுத்து விவாதித்துக் கொண்டிருக்கின்றோம். விவசாய மக்களிடையே சர்க்காருக்கு உண்மையாகவே அனுதாபம் இருக்குமானால் இன்றைய தினம் அம்மாதிரி புயலின் கோரத்தால் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கும் சேதங்களை தவிர்த்து, மிகவும் அதிகமாக நஷ்டமடைந்தோருக்கு என்ன சலுகை அளிக்கப்படுகிறோம் என்பதை அவர்கள் உடனே அறிவித்தாக வேண்டும். உடனடியாக அவர்களுக்கு வீடுகள் கட்டிக் கொடுக்க வசதி செய்து கொடுக்கவேண்டும்.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir . . . ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I am not going to allow a discussion on this matter.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ I am not going to speak on the cyclone itself; I would only like to make a submission and try to convince the Hon. Speaker that this motion is perfectly in order. I will only try to convince, and I hope the Speaker will allow me to convince him. After all, the rule says that an adjournment motion can be moved on a ‘ matter of definite public importance ’.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ But this motion relates to the cyclone.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The cyclone is a matter of very recent occurrence and as a result of the cyclone, havoc has been caused, and thousands of people have been affected.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The Government are not responsible for the cyclone.”

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ And we are not also responsible.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ But the rules say that unless the Government are responsible, it cannot be admitted.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ To-day we are concerned with what measures the Government should take. Normally speaking, it is the Government that should bring forward this subject before this House and take the House into their confidence. Since the Government do not themselves come before the House, there must be some way open to this House to express its ideas on the matter. What else are we here for, I want to know? ”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Unless the Government are responsible for the cyclone, this cannot be brought up before the House. Probably the hon. Member Sri Palaniandi in his speech meant that the Hon. Chief Minister wanted that we should pray to God to bring rain and as a result, the cyclone came. (Laughter.) That is what he meant, I think. (To Mr. Palaniandi.) நீங்கள் நம்முடைய பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் கடவுளை பிரார்த்தித்ததினால் தான் இந்த மாதிரி புயல், மழை, வந்தது என்று சொல்கிறீர்களா ?”

3rd December 1952]

* SRI M. PALANIANDI :—“ நான் அப்படிச் சொல்லவில்லை. மழை பெய்வதற்குப் பிரார்த்தனை நடத்தட்டும். அதைப்பற்றி ஆகேடிபனையில்லை. ஆனால் மழை வேண்டுமென்று வேண்டக் கூடியவர்கள் மழை, புயல் வரும்பொழுது அதனால் அவதிப்படும் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான மக்களுக்கு உதவி செய்ய ஏன் முன் வரவில்லையென்றுதான் கேட்கிறேன். அப்படி முன் வரவேண்டியது சர்க்காரின் கடமையிலையா என்பதையும் யோசிக்க வேண்டும். ஆகவே தான் அதைப்பற்றி விவாதிக்கவேண்டுமென்பதாக நான் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, we are hungry for difficulties and distress. That is the unfortunate situation. The Government must be trusted to administer the country to the best of their ability. The Legislative Assembly is not an administrative body.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, in view of what the Hon. Chief Minister has said, I must crave your pardon for saying a few words. I must say that the rights of this House must be protected. If he says that the Government can be trusted to do what they want, they may as well dispense with the Legislative Assembly. It is part of our duty to draw the attention of the Hon. Ministers and of the Government from time to time as conditions of distress arise and ask them to attend to them and take certain measures.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ But not by adjournment motions.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I hope the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has listened to the wording of the adjournment motion. It says ‘ the vast extent of havoc caused by the cyclone.’ The motion has not indicted the Government. The Government are not responsible for the havoc caused.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ I just want to clear a doubt. The havoc is no doubt caused by an act of God, but then begins the responsibility of the Government to take immediate ameliorative measures.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The wording here is ‘ extent of havoc caused by the cyclone.’ I rule the motion out of order.

“ Mr. Palaniandi has given two motions on the same subject. Having given my ruling on this motion, I need not take up the other motions.”

(3) *Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks.*

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Another adjournment motion has been received from Mr. P. S. Ramachandra Rao, and it reads :

‘ This House do stand adjourned to discuss the serious situation of water scarcity to the cattle in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks in West Godavari district.’ We all know that the scarcity of water has been there for a long time, before we had the recent rains. But how are the Government responsible, I wish to know.”

[3rd December 1952]

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, scarcity conditions might have been there for a long time; but after some time, the cumulative effect of continuous scarcity conditions brings about a grave situation. Anyway I do not wish to argue with you, Sir, on that point. I would be glad to know from you, Sir, some examples of admissible motions.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will give them. When we amend the rules, we shall also clearly say when Members can bring forward adjournment motions.

“ As regards this motion of Mr. Ramachandra Rao, it is not an urgent matter, and therefore, I rule it out of order.”

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

- (1) THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952.
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952).

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Yesterday, Mr. Venkateswarlu was addressing the House in regard to his amendment to clause 13. He may now continue the speech.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ అద్యక్షా, ఇంకో ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు మాట్లాడుతున్నారు. వారి ముగించిన తర్వాత మాట్లాడుతాను. అది వారు వినాలని నా కోరిక—I want him to hear—

‘ఈ సవరణ ప్రధానమైనటువంటి సవరణ. దీన్ని నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. దీనిలో ఉన్నటువంటి విషయమేమిటంటే యిప్పుడు కోర్టులో యీ కాలూదార్ల తరపున, పన్నయాల తరపున ఎవరైనా మాట్లాడవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యం ఉన్నట్లులే, అటువంటిప్పుడు ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు, అంతగా అవసరమైతే వాళ్లు చెప్పకోటానికి తప్పకుండా అవకాశము యిస్తామని చెప్పారు. అదినూడా రూల్సులో వాళ్లకు representation ఉండటంలే చేస్తామని తెలియజేశారు. కాని యిది సరికొత్త పద్ధతికాదు. Act లోనే యీ విషయము ఖచ్చితముగా ఉండాలి. అంతేకాని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన దానికి యింకా మార్పులేమైనా రావచ్చును. అవసరమైన చోట్లు ఉన్నప్పుడు అందరికీ అవసరమే ఉంటుంది. అసలు యీ యాక్టులో general గా tenants అందరికీ ముఖ్యంగా tenants అందరికీ యీ హక్కు ఉండాలి. ఎవరైనా చెప్పకోటానికి ఏమి లేకపోలే చెప్పకోనేందుకు వారి తరపున representation ఉండాలంటే వారికి తప్పకుండా యీ అధికారము ఉండాలని కోరుతూ యీ సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను.’”

11-50
a.m.

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this amendment which seeks to add two sub-clauses to clause 13.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Only sub-clause (6-A) is now under the consideration of the House.”

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ There are five sub-clauses in the clause and a new sub-clause is proposed to be added. In that connexion, I wish to point out that even now under the Criminal Rules of Practice private agents may appear either on behalf of the accused or the complainant and this practice holds good in criminal courts, but of course it has to be done with the

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar]

permission of the presiding Magistrate and he can at his discretion allow it. This practice has been in force in our State for a long time, for nearly fifty years. When such procedure is permitted even in criminal courts, I do not think this amendment is in any way objectionable. But in view of the new sub-clause (6-B) now proposed, I think that with some modification the Government can accept the new sub-clause (6-A). Instead of saying—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be entitled to appear in person or to be represented by any agent not being a legal practitioner.’

a slight modification might be made so that it will lay down that—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be represented by an agent including a legal practitioner or not necessarily being a legal practitioner.’

I submit that the exclusion of the legal practitioner sought to be made by this amendment is not a happy thing because either the tenant or the landlord may require the assistance of a legal practitioner. If the tenants want the assistance of a legal practitioner, we should not try to exclude such assistance; and therefore, I suggest that with the modification suggested by me it would be all right. I submit that in view of the fact that the practice of allowing private persons in criminal courts, has been in force in our State, the amendment is necessary and with the modification I have suggested, I support the amendment.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a matter of legal procedure. Let me take the first part. It is said that—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be entitled to appear in person or to be represented by any agent not being a legal practitioner.’

If we take the words ‘not being a legal practitioner’, a rule or law like this is totally unnecessary because for justice to be done a person should not be prevented from either appearing in person or being represented by an agent. A re-statement of the general law is I think wholly unnecessary. But on behalf of the Government I can promise that we shall be issuing rules in regard to this matter which will be on a line with what obtains under the Code of Criminal Procedure and I am thinking of a rule in these terms. My hon. Friend knows that it is not an amendment but it is going to be issued as a rule—

‘Whenever in any proceeding before a Revenue Court, where a party is represented by a legal practitioner and the other is not, the Court may, in its discretion, permit any agent or any person authorised by such party to plead on his behalf provided that the Court may at any stage cancel such permission.’

Hon. Members may like to know why it is proposed to frame a rule on these lines. Legal practitioners are subject to the discipline of the High Court and they are bound by certain rules of ethics and conduct. If any person other than a legal practitioner is allowed to appear on behalf of the party it will be allowing a person to take part in the proceedings of the court who is subject to no discipline. It is, therefore, necessary to provide for permission to be given when the court thinks it fit, and if afterwards the person’s behaviour calls for it, the court should have the

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[3rd December 1952]

right to withdraw the permission. Otherwise he would have considerable difficulty. That is why provision is made for the cancellation of the permission at any stage of the proceedings. Even in the ordinary courts, those who are not legal practitioners are allowed under those conditions only. Suitable rules will be framed and that would be enough to cover the case. A statement of the law here that every one is entitled to be present is wholly unnecessary unless indeed the object of the Mover was as originally proposed to prevent legal practitioners from appearing in the court, which I think, must be given up—and it is likely to be given up because there is no question of a person not being entitled to be represented by a legal practitioner and that is always taken for granted. But the only thing that is wanted is to make provision for the presence of someone to be there on behalf of the tenants and that can be provided only with suitable restrictions. With these words, I oppose the amendment."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am unable to understand why the Hon. the Chief Minister is so non-receptive to this idea. I put it very strongly, Sir, he is non-receptive to this idea. In his reply to the suggestion from this side of the House that a provision for revision by District Courts must be made, he made it quite clear that he was providing for a piece of legislation which will cost the least to the parties. If it is a question of costly litigation, whatever benefits are sought to be conferred upon the parties by the legislation cannot be availed of by the parties concerned, particularly by the tenants and the pannaiyals. So, here is a position wherein the ordinary procedure applying in the case of the civil and criminal courts cannot obviously apply because under the normal rules of practice in the criminal courts costly litigation results and only in a few cases are private parties allowed to represent particular parties. Those rules should not provide us with an analogy because we are thinking of providing for a machinery by means of which justice could be done cheaply and readily. This is one of the fundamental things that we have got to remember. Mention has been made about discipline and it has been said by the Hon. the Chief Minister that legal practitioners are subject to the discipline of the High Court. But in that connexion, I would like to point out to him that to my knowledge since 1937, in this State, there have been courts which did not deal with criminal questions nor with disputes pertaining to property but they dealt with disputes arising between employees and employers and they were clothed with all the powers of a civil court. These courts have been in existence for the last fifteen or sixteen years but during this long period of time, there was not a single instance brought to the notice of anyone where the people who represented the workers in the courts, and who were not legal practitioners subject to the discipline of the High Court, misbehaved. After all, Sir, why should they misbehave? Is it to their interests or the interests of the parties that they represent that they should do so? I am afraid,

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

Sir, that the Hon. the Chief Minister has failed to appreciate one factor and that is, when I appear before a court, what would be my interest? It would be to see to it that I appeal to the better side of the court."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"That is the first stage."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"The Hon. Minister knows that I have appeared in a number of such cases in Coimbatore."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"We have no personal spite against Mr. Ramamurthi."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am not talking about myself. A number of trade union representatives who are not legal practitioners and therefore, not subject to the discipline of the High Court, appeared in such cases."

"Sir, but there has not been a single case where it was stated that he has infringed the discipline of the High Court or has misbehaved. It is not in our interest to misbehave. On the other hand the question is that the law provides that lawyers alone can appear and a private practitioner can appear only under sufferance when the Revenue Court in its discretion allows him to do so. We are not certain that in every case the Revenue Court will allow him to appear on behalf of a tenant or a pannaiyal. There may be some cases where it may not allow him and what is the remedy? There is no remedy provided for in this clause. Is it provided, for example, that the orders of the Revenue Divisional Officer can be changed in any other court? No. He can use his discretion not to allow a private practitioner to appear on behalf of a tenant or pannaiyal. Then where is justice going to be done?"

12
noon.

"With regard to the draft rule mentioned by the Hon. Chief Minister, I must say that only in such cases where the landlord is represented by a legal practitioner and the tenant or pannaiyal is not able to engage the service of a lawyer, will the Revenue Court exercise its discretion. Now, it obviously happens in certain cases that the landlord himself directly appears. Then what is the position? The landlord, we know, in to-day's society and under the conditions that are existing to-day generally happens to be an educated man. He commands respect from the court and there is a greater amount of receptivity when the landlord speaks before a court. When the pannaiyal speaks, he is generally taken to be an illiterate person, and he cannot put forward his case as effectively as a landlord by virtue of the fact that the landlord happens to be a more educated man. The pannaiyal is placed at a tremendous disadvantage. As in the case of trade union disputes, the tenant or pannaiyal must have the right to choose his own representative irrespective of whether the landlord engages a lawyer or appears in person and the court must accept him. If he misbehaves in the court he can be sent out. I would, therefore,

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

request the Hon. the Chief Minister to make such a provision in this clause, as otherwise justice cannot be rendered to tenants or pannaiyals."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I shall certainly have regard to all that has been urged by the hon. Member and the rule will be properly framed. I may omit the first condition if he wants it to be done straightway. As regards the discretion—whether it should be negative or positive prohibition—that also would be duly considered when the rule is framed. Eminently this question is concerned with the practice of law. We also come into conflict with the provisions made for legal practitioners under the Legal Practitioners Act. All these will be considered and we shall issue a suitable rule. I want the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" In view of the assurance of the Hon. the Chief Minister, I do not press my amendment."

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 13 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 14.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" In view of what has happened yesterday, I am not moving my amendment."

Clause 14 was put and carried.

Clause 15.

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Sir, I move in clause 15—

(i) For the words "to areas outside Tanjore district" occurring in the head line, substitute the words "to areas other than Tanjore district in the State of Madras".

(ii) In sub-clause (1) for the words "in any neighbouring area outside the Tanjore district" substitute the words "in any area other than Tanjore district in the State of Madras".

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member, by his amendment, wants to enlarge the scope of this Bill."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" I want that the provisions of this Bill should be extended to other districts in the State."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then it is out of order. Anyhow let me hear what the Government have to say on this amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I respectfully agree with what the Chair has said. The Bill is with reference to the Tanjore district and certain other adjoining areas where similar conditions prevail. This amendment seeks the extension of the Bill to the whole State."

3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" I rule the amendment out of order but I allow the hon. Member to speak on clause 15."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Sir, there is agrarian unrest throughout the State since 1947 when the then Government issued a questionnaire regarding land reforms and it has become more acute from the time the Agrarian Reforms Committee appointed by the Congress submitted its report and from 1949 when the then Government appointed the Land Revenue Reforms Committee and issued a questionnaire regarding the proposed land revenue reforms, the landlords, the inamdars and the zamindars apprehending some agrarn reforms conferring some rights on cultivating tenants are continuing to evict tenants. It can be seen from the report of the Land Revenue Reforms Committee that there has been large-scale eviction of tenants throughout the State. Sir, there is a lot of litigation going on in the civil and criminal courts. There is much agrarian unrest throughout the State and, therefore, I request the Government to suitably amend the Bill so that it can be extended to other districts also. If it is not possible to extend the Bill to other districts, at least let them issue an Ordinance or come forward with a similar Bill with such modifications and adaptations so that it may apply to the whole State. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not support 12-10 or oppose so far any of the amendments as far as this Bill is concerned because I am in full agreement with the general principles p.m. and the trend of the Bill. While referring this Bill to a Joint Select Committee, I expressed the hope that the Joint Select Committee would make sweeping changes in the Bill. But that has not happened. If I have to say anything of the Bill as it stands now, it is that it does not go far enough. In the first place it does not sufficiently protect the rights of the tenant. It does not make his position any the less precarious or his position more secure. It does bring about certain changes. But I feel it does not satisfy modern conscience. On the other hand, as far as the concessions to the landlord are concerned, I believe it has not done even what the Central Government recommends in their Five-Year Plan, where the landlord is not expected to get more than one-third. But the Bill, as it stands to-day, gives nearly two-thirds. To that extent, I believe the Bill is . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" May I interrupt the hon. Member for a second. I submit, Sir, Dr. Menon is under the mistaken impression that we are now discussing the Bill for the third time. It is not so. We are now on the discussion of the amendment."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Sir, I thought that I could, while speaking on this clause, recommend to the Government that this Bill should be extended to other areas in this State and that I could point out also the defects in the Bill.

" Then, Sir, another criticism that I have to offer against this Bill is that the Bill differentiates between industrial labourer and

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [3rd December 1952]

farm labourer. That discrimination to my mind is not quite justifiable. Both of them should be treated alike; and all the privileges that the industrial labourer enjoys should be extended to the farm labourer. Finally I would say that it has not replaced individual capitalist holding by corporate or co-operative ownership. After all we are not interested in converting the tenant of to-day into the landlord of to-morrow. That does not solve the problem. Our social objective is co-operative ownership or corporate ownership. That also the Bill does not achieve. Even though the Bill is defective in very many respects, I do feel the extension of the Bill to other areas in this State would be beneficial and I wish the Government take the earliest steps to do it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, if the amendment is pressed . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, he is not moving it."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I speak on clause 15, Sir?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is a Government amendment to it. Let the Hon. Minister move his amendment first."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

"In sub-clause (2), for the words "any modifications", substitute the words "such modifications" and for the words "they are so laid", substitute the words "it is so laid"."

Sir, it is a matter of verbal amendment to make the clause more elegant."

*SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment that stands in my name is not necessary if I get certain information. Now, the clause says that the Government may, by notification, make rules to carry out, etc., etc. My object in giving notice of my amendment is that this is a piece of delegated legislation. We are empowering Government in this clause to make rules to carry out the purposes of this measure."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I take it, Sir, we are now on clause 15 and not clause 16. Mr. Ramamurthi is now speaking on clause 16."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am sorry, Sir."

*SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, on clause 15 I want to say that at present, as Government are aware and as Members also are aware, there is a fairly heavy demand in the country that the security of tenure to the tenant and other benefits conferred on the Tanjore tenants may be extended to the tenantry in the whole State. But Government have found some difficulty in making the provisions of this Bill suitable for general application. All the same they have introduced this particular provision in that,

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

they can extend them by notification. Sir, I was one of those who had always objected to giving extensive delegation of powers to the Executive, as the one, to extend the operation of the entire Bill to the entire State just by a mere notification. But I am glad to say that on our suggestions, the Hon. Chief Minister in the Joint Select Committee agreed to certain amendments and they now find a place in sub-clause (2). In so accepting those amendments I appreciate the action of the Hon. Chief Minister, for it serves to go as a precedent in legislative drafting. It also recognizes the right of the Legislature that whenever modifications are sought to be made hereafter they should be brought before the Assembly for its approval before they are put into operation."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to know whether this amendment now under discussion is to omit clause 15."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is now a general discussion on that clause. If the hon. Member wants to oppose this clause, he may do so."

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"Sir, some years back when the Malabar Tenancy Act was passed we were told that that measure was intended to deal with the special conditions of tenancy prevailing in that particular area. Now we have got this Bill dealing with pannaiyals and tenants in Tanjore district. Are we to understand that the provisions of this Bill are to apply to all portions not covered by the Malabar Tenancy Act? Are there only two sets of conditions prevailing in this State, one set of conditions in Malabar and another set of conditions in the other areas? I think this clause 15 itself is unnecessary. For all the provisions of this Bill cannot be extended to the other parts of this State. Because conditions in other parts are totally different from the conditions prevailing in Tanjore district. The system of pannaiyals and the conditions of varam tenant are peculiar to Tanjore district. In Tiruchirappalli and Salem districts, we do not have such conditions. Therefore, I submit clause 15 itself may be omitted."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is no amendment. (Laughter.) I shall now put the Government amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'In sub-clause (2), for the words "any modifications", substitute the words "such modifications" and for the words "they are so laid", substitute the words "it is so laid".'

The amendment was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Mr. Rajagopala Rao's amendment is out of order. So I shall now put clause 15, as amended, to the vote of the House."

Clause 15, as amended, was put and carried.

[3rd December 1952]

Clause 16.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

' That clause 16 do stand part of the Bill.' "

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment that stands in my name may become unnecessary, if I just get certain clarifications. The purpose of my amendment is not to give delegated legislative powers to the Government. If I understand it aright, it is covered by sub-clause (2) of this clause where it is provided that—

' All rules made under this section after the 31st December 1952 shall be laid for not less than fourteen days before the Legislative Assembly of the State as soon as possible after they are made, and shall be subject to such modifications, whether by way of repeal or amendment, as that Assembly may make during the session in which they are so laid.'

Therefore, all rules that are made, automatically and normally, come before the Legislature and the Legislature will have its own say in the matter. The only snag about which I want some clarification is this, namely, that it is provided in the explanation under sub-section (2) that—

' This sub-section shall not apply to any rules made on or before the 31st December 1952.'

I want to know, whether in the interval between the date of coming into force of this Act and the date, 31st December 1952, if some rules are made, they will not normally come before the Legislature or am I to understand that there is no intention to make any rules as some rules have already been made under the Ordinance or whether the Government intend to make rules under this clause only after 31st December 1952 which would then normally come before the Legislature."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I may explain that generally it is intended that the rules already made are enough, but it is likely that we may have to make a few more rules. For instance, I have just mentioned about the appearance of agents and others. It may be necessary to make a few more rules but they will not be of a substantial nature but they will be rules which are necessary to give administrative effect to the Bill itself. We should, therefore, be satisfied with the rules as they are because more rules can be made afterwards. When rules are being added afterwards, they will be discussed and, if any suggestion is made then that an old rule should be modified, it will also be attended to. On this assurance, I think, the hon. Member may rest satisfied."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is already an Act called the Madras Buildings Lease and Rent Control Act. It was first enacted as an Order and then it was passed into an Act. I bring this comparison because the provisions in this Act are more or less similar in nature to the provisions in this Bill in regard to landlords and tenants. In the Rent Control Act there is a specific provision, that is section 9, enabling the Courts to execute orders and decrees passed, and I do not know why

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar]

in this Bill alone it has been delegated to the rule-making powers of the Government. I do not know what exactly is the object of the Government in not making a specific provision as part of the Bill itself for the execution or enforcement of any orders, decisions or awards passed under this Act or for the removal of any doubts or difficulties which may arise in giving effect to the provisions thereof.

"In this connection, I want to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister in charge to one other fact. The Prevention of Hindu Bigamy and Divorce Act came into force in May 1949 but the rules thereunder were framed in October or November 1951 and published in the *Port St. George Gazette* and nearly two and a half years elapsed between the date of coming into force of the Act and the date of rules thereunder being published in the Gazette. Meanwhile, in the course of these two and a half years, neither the courts nor the lawyers nor the parties were properly guided by any rules. I therefore submit that, instead of delegating the matter of execution and enforcement of orders and decisions passed by the Conciliation Officers and the Revenue Courts to the rule-making powers of the Government, a separate clause may be incorporated in the Bill itself."

* Sri VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు లోని clause 16 క్రింద రూల్సు తయారుచేసేటప్పుడు, యీ క్లాజులో ఉన్న ప్రకారంగా మార్పులు ఏమైనా ఉంటే శాసనసభలోనే యీ మార్పులు చేయ వలసియున్నదని ఉన్నది. మొదట గవర్నమెంటు draft rules శాసనసభ table మీద 14 దినములు పుంచవలెననిస్తే, ఆ తర్వాత వాటికి amendments లేకపోతే. అనుబంధానికి చేవచ్చుననే విషయములు తున్నవి. కాని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు చెప్పినట్లు “మీరు అందరు సభ్యులు ఇస్తే, ఆ రూల్సు drafts చేసేటప్పుడు చేర్చరావన్నారు. ఇక్కడ నాకు ఒక అనుమానం వచ్చింది. ఏమిటంటే draft rules, Assembly Table మీద 14 దినములు ఉంచినప్పుడు, ఆ తర్వాత వర్చకు అవకాశముంటుంది. లేకపోతే గవర్నమెంటుకు rule making powers క్రింద సభ్యులు వచ్చించ టానికి అవకాశము లేకపోవచ్చు. కాని notification వల్ల యీ రూల్సు publish చేయవచ్చును అని ఉన్నది. కాని మార్పులు ఏమైనావుంటే, అవి మార్పు టుటువంటి హక్కు శాసనసభకు తున్నది. అప్పుడు అందరు రూల్సు revise చేయ వచ్చు. దీని విషయములూ ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు చెప్పినవిధంగా చేయకపోతే అనుమాన గ్రహంగా ఉంటుంది. కాబట్టి, దీనివిషయమై ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు ఏమి సమాధానము చెప్పారని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“The *Mukhya Mantri* is surprised that the hon. Gentleman, Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, is more suspicious than even Sri P. Ramamurthi.”

(Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah stood up.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member has had his say and he cannot be allowed to speak a second time.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Sir, sub-clause (2) of this clause also was introduced at our instance. I said at the time of

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [3rd December 1952]

the Select Committee and, I also repeat it now, that I appreciate the action of the Hon. the Chief Minister in accepting it. But, there is one point which the hon. Member, Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, wanted the Hon. Chief Minister to clarify. In this connection, I may say that there are two or three methods of the Legislature exercising control over the executive. One method of exercising such control is to make a provision that every rule or notification which Government make should be placed on the table of the House and that it would take effect only after a certain time, that is, after giving an opportunity to any and every Member to move any amendments to those rules. This is the position in regard to clause 15. If a notification is made by the Government extending the operation of this Act to other areas, this clause lays down that this notification must be placed on the table of the House for fourteen days. During those fourteen days any Member will have the right to give notice of an amendment and, if so, the amendment will be brought for discussion as part of the Official Business. It will not be treated as non-official business because the procedure is so provided in the legislation itself. If no amendment has been received or, if the amendment had been considered and disposed of by the House, the notification will come into effect fourteen days after it was placed on the table of the House. The effect of sub-clause (2) in clause 16 is slightly different. In this sub-clause we have consented to give power to the Government to make rules and bring them into effect as soon as they are issued because it is presumed that they generally do not relate to essential matters. They will also be placed on the table of the House for fourteen days and during those fourteen days every Member will have the right to move amendments. Here again these amendments will be treated as part of the Official Business and we have every right to modify those rules. The rules made under clause 15 do not come into effect in the first instance itself, but only when the House has disposed of the matter and fourteen days after they are placed on the table of the House. In the second set of rules made under clause 16, they come into effect at once but can be modified by giving notice of amendments within fourteen days after they are placed on the table of the House. These are two methods of the legislature exercising control over the executive. Hitherto it was not the practice of the Government to make such provisions. We have been fighting for them and, particularly, I have been fighting for the inclusion of such provisions. I was glad that we succeeded in persuading the Hon. the Chief Minister to do this at the Select Committee stage itself and, I hope, that hereafter in the drafting of Bills, the Government will introduce clauses to this effect in regard to rules and notification."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has not followed the suggestions made by me regarding rules for delegated legislation. In the draft rules which have been sent to the Rules Committee Members, I have suggested that we should follow the Centre in this respect."

3rd December 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am very glad that the Hon. the Speaker has taken note of this matter."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall put clause 16 to the vote of the House."

Clause 16 was put and carried.

Clause 17.

MR. SPEAKER:—"As there are no amendments to this clause I propose to put the clause to vote." 12-30 p.m.

Clause 17 was put and carried.

THE SCHEDULE.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The motion is—

'The Schedule do stand part of the Bill.' "

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

'In the Schedule, omit the word "Wages" in line 1.'

Sir, the Schedule not only deals with wages but also with other ways of sharing of the produce. The heading 'Wages,' therefore, is misleading. I am, therefore, moving the above amendment."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker Sir, may I know from the Government what is the object of omitting the word 'Wages'?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I have only to explain that this Schedule is an agreement reached. It deals not only with wages but with maniams, manaikollais, etc. The word 'Wages' at the top of the Schedule is wrong and it should be removed. The law remains just as it is."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I suggest that some other heading like 'Schedule of Remuneration' may be adopted."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In the Schedule, omit the word "Wages" in line 1.' "

The amendment was carried.

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM:—"I beg to move—
'Omit sub-clause (2) (f).'

Sir, my amendment is a simple one and I think, the Hon. the Revenue Minister will accept it and will not oppose it as he is usually doing with amendments moved from this side. The object of the amendment is to see that the wages which a pannaiyal gets should not be restricted. Under sub-clause (f) of clause 2 each pannaiyal will get his share only on the yield from not more than one veli (6 $\frac{2}{3}$ acres) of land belonging to the mirasidar. In clause 2 of the Schedule it has been provided that for harvesting, kalavadi,

[Sri P. B. Rajachidambaram] [3rd December 1952]

chindumani, etc., pannaiyals will be paid 1/7th of the gross produce on the plots on which they have worked as pannaiyals. I should like to know why a pannaiyal should get his share only on the yield from one veli of land alone? Suppose a pannaiyal is clever, hard-working, etc., and wants to work on more than one veli, why should such a person be prevented from working on more than one veli. I request the Government to accept my amendment."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, I expected the hon. Member Sri Rajachidambaram to help us. Instead, I am afraid, he is suggesting something which would make the thing go wrong. I shall explain. It is not generally the practice that plots are divided off for pannaiyals. There may be two or three or four pannaiyals working on a piece of land and they may be working generally more or less in co-operation and it would therefore not be easy always to find out the plot on which a particular pannaiyal has worked, but no one should be deprived of his proper share. There was a normal appraisement as to the size of land which a pannaiyal and his family could look after. That was why this agreement was reached at Mayuram and it was a sensible agreement. It provides two conditions. One is that he shall have to work actually on the plot of land and the other is that he shall not in any case be denied his remuneration. It was thought that there should be no room for claiming that a person worked on an impossible area. That is why these two limits are there. In view of the existing circumstances it would not be right for us now to tamper with the agreement already reached."

MR. SPEAKER :—" May I take it that the hon. Member Sri Rajachidambaram is not pressing his amendment."

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM :—" I am not pressing my amendment, Sir."

The amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, what about my general amendment? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, I am afraid that the amendment is out of order."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member cannot move such an amendment."

SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, on a point of information. The Assembly passed clause 8 with all its amendments. I have now received notice of amendment given by the Hon. the Revenue Minister for clause 8, sub-clause (2). Is it right, Sir, for the Government to go on giving notice of amendments like this? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" They are only verbal amendments intended to correct grammatical mistakes."

3rd December 1952]

* SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR:—" Mr. Speaker Sir, there seems to be some defect in clause (1) of the Schedule. The Government's intention according to this clause is that every pannaiyal will be paid daily wages at one marakkal and every woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal. But the wording of the clause, as it is, shows that the entire body of pannaiyals working under a mirasidar will only get one marakkal. If the intention of the Government is that each pannaiyal should be paid daily wages at one marakkal and each woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal, the wording of this clause should be changed. It should be stated in the clause that each pannaiyal will get daily wages at so many marakkals, and that each woman labourer will get daily wages at so many marakkals. If this is not stated clearly, the landowner may say that all the pannaiyals employed by him will get only one marakkal. I am certain that such a thing is not intended by the Government."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" We have not invented this clause. We have only reproduced the Mayuram Award as a Schedule. The meaning of the clause is quite clear; each pannaiyal will be paid daily wages at one marakkal and each woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal."

SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR:—" Why not we make a slight verbal alteration to make the position clear? "

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—" We do not want to tamper with the Mayuram Award. We want to reproduce it as it is."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—" Now that it has been clearly stated in the House what is intended, we may not change the wording of the agreement reached. The matter has been explained on the floor of the House and that should be enough."

MR. SPEAKER:—" I shall put the Schedule as amended to the vote of the House."

The Schedule as amended was put and carried.

Clause 1.

MR. SPEAKER:—" Now, we will go back to the Short Title and the Preamble to the Bill. First, we shall take up the Short Title. Regarding that, hon. Members have given notice of certain amendments for enlarging the scope of the Bill. I wish to inform hon. Members that if they want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, they cannot do so at this stage. I am therefore ruling all the amendments out of order."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—" I would like to make one submission in this connection and that is, it was because we anticipated that some such thing will happen . . ."

[3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—Even if the amendments had been brought forward at an earlier stage, I would have ruled them out of order. The hon. Member is new to the procedure of the Assembly and I would advise him to consult the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the matter. Even if the Government want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, what they should do is, they must withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill. That is why in the case of the other Bill, namely, the Motor Vehicles Bill, I advised the Government to withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill because the Select Committee had no right to enlarge the scope of the Bill.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the Government to come forward with a Bill and another thing to enlarge the scope of a Bill which they themselves have proposed. Whatever might be the powers of the Government, I submit, this House, as a sovereign body, has always got the right to enlarge the scope of a Bill. We are a sovereign body and if we feel that a particular Bill must be enlarged, or for the matter of that, this particular Bill must be applied throughout the State, the House has got a right to take it up.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There are methods by which they can do that and the parliamentary method of doing it is to withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill. Whether the Government do that or the hon. Members do that, I have no objection to that.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The point is this, Sir. We know the difficulties of non-official members and the non-official side of this House has not got equal opportunities with the Government. Of course, there are so many methods. We ourselves can bring forward a Bill and when the Government bring forward a Bill we, as a sovereign body, can change the scope of the Bill. It is, of course, open to the House to accept it or not.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ If the Government want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, as I said, they will have to bring in a fresh Bill.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The Speaker regulates the procedure in a sovereign body.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ What I want to submit to the Speaker is that we need not copy all that is being done in England. We can set our own traditions and settle our own precedents and we have got sufficient genius in the country to settle our own traditions and precedents. If we think that in the interests of all, it is necessary and expedient to discuss a particular Bill and the House itself agrees to the enlargement of the scope of the Bill, then nothing can stand in the way. Simply because a particular procedure is followed in the British Parliament, I do not think, we should be bound by that procedure.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ All Legislatures follow this procedure. If the hon. Member wants we can change this rule also. But till that is done, we will have to follow the existing procedure.”

3rd December 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Where are the rules saying that we cannot change the scope of the Bill?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"If the hon. Member wants he can speak on the clause."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, in view of the large number of amendments proposed and rejected by the House I am sure that hon. Members will not propose extending this Bill to all parts of the State without very much more consideration. So, I do not think they will move the amendments at all even if permitted."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Permit and then see."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఇక్కడ ఒక చిన్న విషయమున్నది. ఈ బిల్లు ప్రారంభములోనే దీనిని తీసుకోవలసినదని మేము చెప్పాము."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member can speak in English at least for my sake."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"మేము ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొనినపుడు ప్రారంభంలో దీని title తీసుకోవలసిందని చెప్పాము. దానిని మొదట తీసుకొన్నట్లయితే, బిల్లును ఆ ప్రకారంగా మార్చడానికి అవకాశముంటుంది. అందుచేతనే మొట్టమొదట title ను, మొదటి క్లాజును తీసుకోవడం చాలా ముఖ్యమని, దాని ప్రాధాన్యతను గుర్తించే మేము ఆ విధంగా proceed కావాలని చెప్పాము. కాని, సాధారణంగా Parliamentary సాంప్రదాయాన్ని బట్టి మిగత క్లాజులన్నీ తీసుకొనిన తరువాతనే, title గాని, మొదటి క్లాజుగాని తీసుకోవలసియుంటుందని అభిప్రాయపడి ఆ విధంగానే ఇప్పుడు చేశారు. ఇదివరకు జరిగిన చర్చలలో, ఇతర క్లాజులన్నీ accept చేస్తు వచ్చాము. ఇప్పుడు చివరకు ఈ title కు మొదటి క్లాజుకు వచ్చాము. ఈ ఆనెంట్టి ఇప్పుడున్నటువంటి బిల్లును ఈ మాసములో మొత్తము రాష్ట్రమంతట పరిష్కరించేయ దలచుకొన్నట్లయితే, ఇప్పుడు ఆ విధంగా చేసేందుకు ఆనెంట్టికి అధికారమున్నదా, లేదా ఆనెట్టువంటి point of order వచ్చినప్పుడు, దానికి మీరు రూలింగ్ ఇచ్చేటప్పుడు, ఈ ఆనెంట్టికి ఈమాత్రము అధికారం లేకపోతే, ఇంక ఏదీ ఉన్న అధికారమేమిటి, ఆనెట్టువంటి విషయాన్ని మీరు తరచిచూచి order ఇవ్వాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have heard enough of discussion on this matter and I am going to give my ruling straightaway. This Tanjore Ordinance was issued long ago and this Bill is the outcome of that Ordinance."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఈ బిల్లును extend చేయకూడదని ఎక్కడైనా rules ఉన్నవా?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"According to parliamentary practice, if they want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, they should withdraw it. If the Government want they can withdraw it and bring in a fresh Bill."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"అందుచేతనే మేము మొట్టమొదటనే ఈ title ను వర్చిస్తామని చెప్పాము. అమాదిరి జరిగియుంటే, అప్పుడు ఇది vito అయ్యేదో లేక కొత్తగా తయారై ఉండేదో తేలిపోయి ఉండేది."

[3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member is new to the House and if he listens to Mr. Viswanatham's advice, he will be convinced."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" In any case, I would say for the information of Mr. Nagi Reddi that it does not matter whether this clause is taken up first or later on. But the only point is whether we can extend the scope of the Bill. The accepted convention and the rule is that it is not open to the House to extend the scope of the Bill by way of amendment. That is the recognized principle. On the other hand, if it is intended to extend the scope of the Bill, the only thing that can be done is to withdraw the Bill and bring in another Bill. If the House feels that this Bill is not sufficient and that some other Bill with wider scope should be brought in, the only course open to the House is to throw out this Bill. It is not as if we are blindly following the British Parliament, but we are following a practice so that the business of the House can be got through properly and expeditiously. Therefore, when once we want to extend the scope of the Bill, all sorts of things will come in and we will not be able to transact the business of the House. That is why this Bill has been prepared with a limited scope. If that is not acceptable, it is always open to the House to throw it out and force the Government to bring in another Bill with an extended scope."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Now the motion before the House is that clause 1, ' Short Title and Commencement ' do stand part of the Bill. I will allow speeches on this motion."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" On a point of order, Sir, ' In clause 15 it is stated " in any neighbouring area outside the Tanjore district . . . " "

అని ఈ విధంగా ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకునూడ ఈ బిల్లిను extend చేయవచ్చునని ఖచ్చితంగా అందులో ఉన్నది. దీంతో Tanjore జిల్లా బయట ప్రక్కన ఉన్నటువంటి జిల్లాలకునూడ దీనిని extend చేసేందుకు ఒక మార్గము విచ్చాటు చేయబడినది."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then it is a wrong interpretation."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" మీరు చెప్పింది మేము ఓప్పుకొంటాము. అయితే, దీంతో outside the Tanjore district అని clear గా చెప్పబడినది. కనుక దీనిని ఇతర చోట్లకు extend చేయడానికి వట్టి రీత్యాకూడా ఇది అవకాశమిస్తున్నది. ప్రభుత్వము ఈ విధంగా చేయడానికి ఈ క్లాజు అవకాశమిస్తున్నది. అందువల్ల దీనిని రాష్ట్రమంతటికి వర్తించేటట్లు amendment move చేయడానికి ఇప్పుడు అవకాశమున్నది. కనుక ఆ ప్రకారము దీనిని సవరించి రాష్ట్రమంతటికి వర్తించేటట్లు చేయవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను."

12-50
p.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, the hon. Member has not spoken on the motion before the House. He has spoken on the amendment which has been ruled out of order."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" To be fair to Mr. Venkateswarlu, I must say that he was only making a request to the Chair to reconsider the ruling and he was not disputing the ruling."

3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think he said that the scope could be enlarged so as to make the Bill applicable to the whole State because sub-clause (2) of clause 1 said *inter alia* that the Act shall come into force in any other area in the adjoining districts in the State of Madras. I think he is giving a wrong interpretation."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"అధ్యక్ష, ఒక విధంగా ఇదిచాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి బిల్లు. దీని విషయమై మీరు రూలింగు ఇచ్చారు. మీ రూలింగు ననుసరించి మాట్లాడుచున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము ఈ బిల్లును ఎప్పుడైతే ప్రకటిస్తుందో, రాష్ట్రమునకు అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో పెద్ద పెద్ద ఘాస్వాములు కొలు దార్లను ఘాములనుండి తొలగించడం జరుగుతుందనే విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము దృష్టికి తీసుకువచ్చాము. కాని ఈ రోజున దీనిని సవరించడానికి ఆవశ్యకము లేదంటున్నారు. అయితే దీని ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపములో ఇట్లాగే వదలిపెట్టినట్లయితే, అసగా, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని సమస్యలను పరిష్కారించేయకుండా, ఈ చట్టాన్ని ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపములో ప్రవేశపెట్టినట్లయితే, ఘాస్వాములు కొలుదార్లను తప్పకుండా ఘాములనుండి తొలగించి, ఆ ఘాములను పంచాయితీలగా వారి స్వాధీనం చేసుకోవడం జరుగుతుంది. ఉదాహరణకు నా నియోజకవర్గములో ముత్తాలరాజు అనే ఘాస్వామి తన ఘాముల నన్నింటిని స్వంతకమతానికి తీసుకొని చాలా కాలముగా పనిచేస్తున్నటువంటి రైతులను తొలగించి, ఆ ఘాములను ఆక్రమింపడం జరుగుతుంది. ఇటువంటి దారుణమైన పరిస్థితులు సంభవిస్తున్నాయి. ఈ విషయము గురించి ముగ్గురికొరికి కలెక్టరుకు ఎంతోమంది చెప్పినప్పటికీ లాభము లేకపోయింది. ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఇటువంటి కిష్టపరిస్థితులు విర్రవీసిపోయి, కనుక అక్కడనే దీనిని వర్తింప చేస్తున్నాము అని ప్రభుత్వము చెప్పడం సరియైనదికాదు. వల్లదు తాలూకాలో చూచినట్లయితే, అక్కడ ఉన్న దారుణపరిస్థితులలో రైతులు జైల్లకు పోవడంకూడ జరుగుతుంది. కనుక నేను ప్రభుత్వానికి మనవిచేస్తున్నది ఏమంటే ప్రభుత్వము కనుక ఈ బిల్లును ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు extend చేయకుండా ఇప్పుడున్న రూపములోనే అమలుజరిపినట్లయితే, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని పెద్ద పెద్ద ఘాస్వాములు తమ ఘాముల నుండి తప్పకుండా రైతులను తొలగిస్తారు, అనేక తగాదాలు, ఘర్షణలు బయలుదేరుతాయి. రైతులు నానావస్థలు పడుతారు. అప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము, కమ్యూనిస్టు లేదో గందరగోళము చేసినారు. అందుకే ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు వచ్చాయని అనడం సరికాదు. ఆ కారణము ఏ విధంగానూ ఒప్పుకోలేకపోయింది. కనుక అలాంటి కిష్టపరిస్థితులు, తగాదాలు ఏవి కలుగకుండునట్లు, ఇప్పుడే దీనిని అన్ని ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింప చేయవలసియింటుందని తెలియచేస్తున్నాను. చాలా జమీందారీ areas లో, కళా వెంకటరావు ధర్మమా అన్నట్టు వారి జమీందారీ వట్టుకుద్వారా, చాలామంది అసాములు ఘాస్వాములుగా తయారైనారు. అటువంటి ప్రాంతాలలో అంతాగూడాను రైతులు ఎక్కవ చెబ్బి తినవలసివస్తుంది. అందువల్ల ఈ బిల్లును ఒక్క Tanjore జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేసినట్లయితే, ఇతరచోట్ల చాలా దారుణపరిస్థితులు సంభవించినప్పుడు, తగాదాలు విపరీతమైనప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము పోలీసులను తుపాకులతో సిద్ధము కల్పింతుంది. ఇది అందరికీ తెలిసినవిషయమే. కనుక అటువంటి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడకుండా, ప్రభుత్వము ఈ చట్టాన్ని అంతటా వర్తింపజేయవలసిందని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లును ఇప్పటివరకువచ్చామునే ప్రవేశపెట్టినట్లయితే, చాలామంది tenants చాలా యిబ్బందులు పడుతారనే విషయాన్ని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. కనుక దీనిని వారు పునరాలోచించి తగు మైన రీతి సవరించవచ్చునని తెలిజేస్తున్నాను."

[3rd December 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లు వి పరిస్థితులలో ఈ నాడు amendment చర్చకు వచ్చినదో, ఆ పరిస్థితులనుంచి మనము బయటపడడానికి ఈ బిల్లు ఉపయోగపడుతున్నదా అనేటటువంటి విషయాన్ని మనము చాలా జాగ్రత్తగా విచారించాలి. ఈనాడు రాష్ట్రములో ఉన్న పరిస్థితులు విమిటి, రాష్ట్ర మొత్తము మీద ప్రమాదమైన ఆర్థిక దుస్థితిమూలంగా ఎక్స్‌చిక్యూటును ఎదుర్కొంటున్న సమయములో వచ్చినటువంటి బిల్లు ఇదియని గమనించవలసియైనది. ఒక్క తంజావూరులోనే అక్కడి ఖాస్యాములకు, కౌలుదార్లకు మధ్య వచ్చినటువంటి తగాదాలమూలంగానే ఈ బిల్లు అక్కడికి వచ్చినది అనుకొనడం ఎంత ప్రధానమైనప్పటికీ, ఈనాడు రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద ఉన్నటువంటి ఆర్థిక దుస్థితినుంచి వివిధంగా బయటపడడమూ అనే ఆలోచనతో, ఆ దుస్థితినుంచి బయటపడడానికి ప్రభుత్వము మార్గాలు అన్వేషిస్తూ ఇటువంటి బిల్లు తీసుకొనిరావడం ఇది ఒక మార్గమని దీనిని తీసుకొనివచ్చినది. ఈ నాడు దేశములో పరిస్థితి ఎట్లా ఉన్నది అని చూచినట్లయితే, గ్రామస్థులలో ప్రజానీకానికి తినడానికి తిండి, కట్టుకోడానికి గుడ్డ లేకుండా వారి కొనుగోలు శక్తి నశించినది. రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద, ఇప్పుడు ఒక్క పారిశ్రామికీకరణకాక, వ్యవసాయదారులకేగాక, మధ్యతరగతి ప్రజలందరికీ, అన్ని చోట్లాకూడా ఈ దుస్థితి పెరిగిపోయింది. ఈసందర్భములో మనము ఈ economic crisis నుంచి బయటపడడానికి మార్గము విమిటి అని ఆలోచించాలి. దీని కొరకు మనము చేసేత గుడ్డలు కొనండి అని ప్రజకు చెప్పినంత మాత్రానగాని, లేక, మధ్యతరగతి ప్రజలను కష్టపడి పనిచేయాలి అని చెప్పినంత మాత్రానగాని, లేక ఖాస్యాములకు కౌలుదార్లకు మధ్య సన్నిహితమైన స్నేహము, సౌభ్రాతృత్వము, ప్రేమ పూర్వకమైన సంబంధాలు ఉండాలి అని అన్నంత మాత్రాన ఈ దుస్థితినుంచి బయట పడడం అసంభవము నేటటువంటి విషయము ఈ నాడు అందరికీ తెలుసును. కాబట్టి ఈ దుస్థితినుండి వివిధంగా అయిన తప్పించుకోవడానికి ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొని రాబడినప్పుడు, ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యమేమిటి. అక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి వివిధ వర్గాల మధ్య వచ్చినటువంటికష్ట పరిస్థితులనుంచి కొద్దిగా, తాత్కాలికంగా అయినా సరే, బయట పడడానికిని రెండవది ఈనాడున్నటువంటి ఆర్థికదుస్థితినుంచి మనను రక్షించుకోవడానికి ఈ బిల్లు చేపడింది అంటే అందులో సందేహములేదు. కనుక ఈ బిల్లులో ఉన్నటువంటి ప్రాధాన్యత విమిటంబే, మొట్టమొదటి సారిగా మన రాష్ట్రములో ప్రభుత్వము ఈ ఖాస్యాములకు కౌలుదార్లకు మధ్య ఉన్నటువంటి తగాదాలను తొలగించడం చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటిదని గుర్తించింది. ఈ నాడు కౌలుదార్లకు అన్యాయము జరుగుచున్నదని ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించి, ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఇటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయని ప్రభుత్వము అభిప్రాయపడుచున్నప్పుడు మేము ఈ వైపునుంచి ఈ పరిస్థితులు రాష్ట్రంతో అన్నిచోట్లకూడ ఉన్నాయని కనుక ఈ బిల్లును రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద వర్తింపజేయాలని, తదనుగుణంగా సవరణలు తీసుకురావలసి మేము ప్రయత్నాలు చేశాము. కాని ఇక్కడున్నటువంటి (procedure, rules) ప్రకారము చూకు అది సాధ్యముకాక పోయినందుకు చాలా విచారిస్తున్నాము. ఇదివరకు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రశ్నితరముల కాలములో, ఈ బిల్లును ఇతర చోట్ల కూడ వర్తింప జేయటకు ప్రయత్నము చేస్తున్నాము, త్వరలోనే చేస్తాము, అటువంటి రిపోర్టుకూడ మావద్దకు వచ్చినది, దాని పరిశీలన అయిన శరువాత దీనికి పూనుకొంటామని (Land Revenue) మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. ఈ బిల్లు చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటిదనే సందర్భములో నేను వారికి కొన్ని సూచనలు చేయదలచాను. ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క scope) ఇంక ఎక్కువగా ఉండాలి అని కోరుతున్నప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము అందుకు ఒప్పుకో

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

లేదు. ప్రస్తుతము తంజావూరులోని క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులే దీనికి కారణమని చెప్పారు. కాని ఈ నాడు మనము ఈ ఆర్థిక దుస్థితినుంచి బయట పడడానికి ప్రజలలో కొనుగోలు శక్తి ఎక్కువ చేయాలంటే, ప్రజల ఎంత కష్టపడి తని చేస్తున్నారో ఆ కష్టానికి సగటునంటి ఫలిత ముండాతి అనే దానికనుగుణంగా ఒక బిల్లును తీసుకురావాలి. అప్పుడే ప్రజలయొక్క కొనుగోలుశక్తి పెరుగుతుంది. ఈ సందర్భములో కొన్ని సూచనలుచేస్తూ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ వారిచ్చినటువంటి రిపోర్టును (general) గా ప్రభుత్వము ఒప్పక పోయినందుకు నేను చాలా విచారిస్తున్నాను. ప్రస్తుత పరిస్థితులలో ఈ బిల్లుగురించి మేము, దీనిని ఇతరత్రాకూడ వ్యాపింప చేయాలని కోరగా, ఈ విషయాన్ని పరిశీలిస్తున్నాము. త్వరలో చేయబోతామని హామీ ఇచ్చినది కాబట్టి దీనిని త్వరలో ఇతర చోట్లకు కూడ తీసుకొని వస్తారని అనుకొంటున్నాను. లేక పోయినట్లయితే ఇతర జిల్లాలలో దారుణమైన పరిస్థితులు సంభవిస్తాయి. రైతులు అనేక ఇబ్బందులకు గురి అవుతారు. ఎన్నోతగాదాలు బ్రదుకుదరురాయి. కనుక అటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు వచ్చేవరకు ఊరక యుండి, అవి ఏర్పడిన తరువాత ఆ మంటలన్నీ ఒకేసారి ఆస్పరామంటే, అప్పుడు రైతులకు, తీరిన నష్టము సంభవించి యుంటుంది. కనుక అటువంటి పరిస్థితులు రాకముందే, దీనిని ఇతర చోట్లకు వర్తింప చేసేందుకు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రయత్నించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I did not wish to interrupt Mr. Nagi Reddi. Both Mr. Venkateswarlu and Mr. Nagi Reddi spoke as if the motion before the House were that the Bill be passed into law. They made general observations which had nothing to do with the clause 1 that is before the House.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The position is that their remarks are applicable to the third reading stage also.”

* RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall confine my remarks to the limit set down by the Hon. Chief Minister. The motion before the House relates to Short Title and commencement. I shall not take up the time of the House with reference to the Short Title. But with regard to commencement, I should like to say a few words. It has been argued that this Bill should apply to all parts of the State. The conditions in all parts of the State are not all alike. The extension of this Bill may not suit the conditions in many parts of the State, unless several clauses are modified and new clauses introduced. In taking power to extend the Bill to certain other areas, the Government have been careful and wise enough to use the words ‘ in any other area in the adjoining districts ’ in contrast to the words ‘ in any other area in the outside districts. ’ The use of ‘ outside districts ’ may mean that the Government may skip over one or two districts. But that is not the intention of the Bill. Conditions may be similar in adjoining areas like the Chidambaram taluk of the South Arcot district, and Tiruchirappalli district. Even within the Tanjore district, the tenants in certain areas only will be benefited by this Bill, as in the other areas the tenants are getting more from the landlord than what this Bill provides for. Sri Venkateswarlu does not know as much about Tanjore as I know.

[Raja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad] [3rd December 1952]

I know several hundreds of instances where the pannaiyal or tenant wants the present practice to continue in preference to what is provided for in the Bill. I am not at all saying that the Bill should oust the present custom or practice if that is better and conducive to cordial relationship between the landlord and the tenant. I shall not discuss the general principles of the Bill, as we can discuss them in the third reading stage which will come up in the afternoon. With regard to the area of the application of this Act, I wish to say that it is better to watch the working of this Bill in the Tanjore district, study the reactions, and remedy the defects before extending it to other areas. We have got to deal with an enormous number of Conciliation Officers and Revenue Courts, we have got to see how their judgments are implemented and what the tenant-landlord relationship is going to be in the future. All of us are interested in more production and it is no use talking of more production without the co-operation of the landlord. It is well known that the pannaiyal or tenant has not got the wherewithal for carrying out agricultural operations. That being so, let us pray for the success of this Bill in the Tanjore district to which it is confined, with all the goodwill of this House and the good intentions of the Government. I am very glad that the Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. Revenue Minister limited the scope of this Bill to Tanjore district. If the Government want to extend this Bill to other parts of the State, they should extend it very carefully. I would request them not to extend this Bill by notification. If they want to apply the principles underlying this Bill to Rayalaseema or the other Andhra districts or the southern districts like Tirunelveli, Madurai and Ramanathapuram, I would request them to bring in a separate legislation. Two-thirds of Ramanathapuram district is zamindari area belonging to the Raja of Ramanathapuram and the Zamindar of Sivaganga. When the zamindaris were there, the tenants were getting fifty per cent of the produce. After their conversion into ryotwari area, the ryotwari pattadars also are giving the tenants fifty per cent of the produce. I am pleading for giving fifty per cent to the tenant. Mr. Venkateswarlu is aghast at my pleading and it takes his breath away. Instead of extending this Bill by notification and discussing the notification on the floor of this House, we can bring in a new legislation and discuss it. It is quite possible that the working of this Bill in Tanjore may have the effect of making the landlords and tenants in the other districts to settle among themselves amicably and it may not be necessary to bring in any new legislation at all. While I am not against legislation for the other parts of the State, I only want that the legislation should take due note of the custom prevailing in each area.

“Finally, I congratulate the Government on the very wise step they have taken in bringing forward this measure. Let us wish all good luck to the Government in carrying out this measure successfully in the Tanjore district.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I wish to remind the House that the hon. Members have another opportunity of saying what they have

3rd December 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

got to say on the Bill at the third reading stage, I shall put clause 1 to the vote of the House."

Clause 1 was put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Government have given notice of some verbal amendments. Let the Hon. Minister for Revenue move them."

Clause 2.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move—

'In clause 2, letter the last paragraph as sub-clause (m) and for the initial word "All" substitute the word "all".'"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In clause 2, letter the last paragraph as sub-clause (m) and for the initial word "All" substitute the word "all".'"

The amendment was carried.

Clause 6.

Sub-clause (2).

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move—

'For the words "be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer" substitute the words "on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled".'

This amendment only puts the clause in the proper form."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'For the words "be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer" substitute the words "on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled".'

The amendment was carried.

Clause 7.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move— 1-10 p.m.

'In sub-clause (c) omit the word "and" occurring after the word "fertilisers".'

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In sub-clause (c) omit the word "and" occurring after the word "fertilisers".'

The amendment was carried.

[3rd December 1952]

Clause 8.

Sub-clause (2).

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' After the words " tenancy provides for any rent ", insert the words " and not for the sharing of the actual produce raised " . '

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' After the words " tenancy provides for any rent ", insert the words " and not for the sharing of the actual produce raised " . '

The amendment was carried.

Clause 12.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' In sub-clause (3), for the words " to all the rights " substitute the words " in all the rights " . '

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In sub-clause (3), for the words " to all the rights " substitute the words " in all the rights " . '

The amendment was carried.

Clause 13.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' In sub-clause (1) second paragraph, after the words " tenancy provides for any rent ", insert the words " and not for the sharing of the actual produce raised " . '

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In sub-clause (1) second paragraph, after the words " tenancy provides for any rent ", insert the words " and not for the sharing of the actual produce raised " . '

The amendment was carried.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' In sub-clause (4) omit the word " the " occurring before " Madras Ordinance IV of 1952 " . '

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In sub-clause (4) omit the word " the " occurring before " Madras Ordinance IV of 1952 " . '

The amendment was carried.

3rd December 1952]

Clause 14.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

'In the last line for the words "its scope" substitute the words "its or his scope".'

The court can be called 'it', but a conciliation officer cannot be called 'it', and hence this amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

'In the last line for the words "its scope" substitute the words "its or his scope".'

The amendment was carried.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

'That the Bill, as amended, be passed into law.'

Let me thank all hon. Members for their co-operation and criticisms on this Bill. I thank not only the Members who took part in the debate but also other hon. Members who, though they did not take part in the discussion, have intelligently followed the debate and have voted on the various clauses and amendments. A criticism was levelled that this Bill did not cover the whole State but it was restricted to Tanjore district. It is so because it was rather urgent that some legislation should be brought forward for that district. There was already a sort of agreement between the landholders and tenants in that district which was crystallised in the Mayuram Agreement. So, we had a starting point on which we could proceed. It is not so in the case of other districts. Hon. Members asked why this Bill should not be extended to other districts. I may tell them that only districts adjoining Tanjore can come under the purview of this Bill. Other districts cannot come. I am as anxious as other hon. Members are, regarding the plight of the tenants in districts other than Tanjore. This is a subject for separate consideration. We have not forgotten other districts. We are as much alive to the situation in other districts as hon. Members are. Under the parliamentary system, Opposition Members are at liberty to suggest, elaborate and far-reaching reforms. But the Government have to examine them and formulate cautiously. Even to a small Bill like this, which is applicable to only one district, there had been so much of opposition and criticism. How much more will be the opposition to a Bill which will be applicable to all the districts? I am so full of the discussion that has been going on that I have no time to think clearly of the potentialities of this Bill. Therefore, I do not want to expatiate on this Bill. I am not a believer in talk. I am a believer in actual results. Let us all hope that this Bill will bring about that result which we all desire. Let us bless this Bill, and let us hope that the relations between the landholders and the tenants will hereafter be as good and cordial as they were in bygone days.

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [3rd December 1952]

We shall hope that there will be a greater production in that district from now. Sir, I request hon. Members to pass this Bill unanimously."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I must tell the House that the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952, and the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, were before the House for a very long time. I have allowed enough time for the hon. Members to give notice of amendments. I have already received hundreds of amendments. No more time will be allowed to hon. Members. If any hon. Member wishes to give notice of amendments, he must do so before 3 p.m. to-day. Now the motion before the House is—

' That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952), as amended, be passed into law."

* RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Minister, belonging to the party to which I have the honour to belong, has moved that the Bill, as amended, be passed into law. The hon. Member Mr. Venkateswarlu need not think that I am opposed to this Bill. Sir, I am standing here only to give my fullest support to the Bill. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi: ' As a Congressman? ') I am really a Congressman. The hon. Member is not a Congressman. Both are true. The question of agrarian reforms has been engaging the attention of the politicians of South India for a long time. I am glad that we have not copied agrarian legislations in other States without reference to our own conditions in this State. I should like to congratulate the Hon. the Chief Minister and Hon. the Revenue Minister on their not having copied the Bombay scheme or any other scheme. They have brought forward a Bill which would suit our requirements.

1-20
p.m. " As regards the agrarian disturbances in the Tanjore district, nobody regrets them more than I. I shall not go into the causes of the disturbances. Let us only hope that this legislation will give the quietus to the disturbances and that this will not give any occasion for any people to disturb hereafter the peace and tranquillity of the place which is essential for increased production. Everybody in this country, right from the Prime Minister of India down to the villager, is anxious to increase production, particularly of rice. It will not be possible to increase production if these tenants and pannaiyals do not co-operate with each other in the Tanjore district. As regards the co-operation on the part of the landowners, I can say—though I do not own any land in the Tanjore district—on behalf of the people who are owning lands in that district, that they have been equally anxious to foster the best relationship between themselves and the tenants on the one hand and the tenants and the pannaiyals on the other. As I have already said, the terms and conditions on which the tenants and the pannaiyals are working in some places are more favourable than those provided in the Bill itself. In fact, in some places where terms and conditions provided in this Bill are sought to be imposed,

3rd December 1952] [Raja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad]

the tenants and pannaiyals do not like them but want the old conditions to continue. Therefore, persons, who have not been able to see eye to eye with all the provisions of the Bill, can have the consolation that the tenants and pannaiyals are not over-anxious about these provisions. Anyway, we are glad that we are giving statutory recognition to the rights and privileges of the tenants and pannaiyals. Let us only hope that they will also co-operate with each other and increase production.

"The Bill is necessary not merely for giving security of tenure to the pannaiyals and the tenants but also for giving the quietus to the disturbances in Tanjore. It is from that standpoint that I welcome this Bill and congratulate the Government on the wise step that they have taken. With reference to the agrarian situation in other parts of the State, I shall only repeat my request that in course of time the Government may consider the enactment of a legislation to suit particular areas. Let us hope that in the coming years rice production will go up to a considerable extent in this area in particular."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లులో కొన్ని లోపములున్నప్పటికీ దీనియొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశాన్ని గమనించి మొట్టమొదటిసారిగా ఇటువంటి బిల్లును ప్రభుత్వము తీసుకొని వచ్చినందుకు వారిని అభినందిస్తున్నాను. అయితే ఆ అభినందనను పూర్తిగా ఇవ్వలేక పోతున్నందుకు పిచారమున్నాను. తారణమేమిటంటే మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో, మొత్తంగా అన్నిచోట్ల ఖాస్సాములకు రైతులకు ఆనేక విధమైనటువంటి వివాదాలు, జరుగుతున్నప్పటికీ, వాటిని గుర్తించకుండా, ఒక్క తంజావూరులోనే ఈ క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయని అక్కడ మాత్రమే దీనిని వర్తింప జేయుట సరియైంది కాదు. ఉదాహరణకు ఒక విషయము చెప్పుచున్నాను సత్తెనపల్లి తాలూకాలో వడపల్లి గ్రామములో వంద సంవత్సరాలనుంచి పాలము దున్నుతున్నటువంటి రైతులను వారు ఖాస్సాములకు వ్యతిరేకంగా నడచుకొంటున్నారనే తారణంచేత ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అండగా పెట్టుకొని మూడువందల రైతాంగాన్ని పాలము నుండి తొలగించుటకు మూడు మాసములు వారి మధ్య పెవారా పెవారీగా పోరాటము జరిగింది. ప్రభుత్వము అండ తోటి ఆ రైతులను ఈనాడు పాలమినుండి వెళ్లగొట్టడము జరిగింది. ఆ ప్రకారము వంద సంవత్సరాలుగా ఆ పాలములో పని చేస్తున్నప్పటికీ కూడా, ఈ నాడు ఈ పాలము, మాదికాదు అని బయటికి వెళ్లవలసిన పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడింది కనుక ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఇటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడినాయి, కనుక అక్కడే దీనిని అమలుజరుపుతున్నాము అని అనుకోవడం చాలా పొరబాటు. ఈ బిల్లును గనుక ఈ రూపములో అమలు పెట్టినట్లయితే, తప్పక ఇతర చోట్లంతాకూడ ఖాస్సాములు రైతులను తొలగించేదుకు ప్రయత్నంచేస్తారు, ఆ మూలకంగా ఎన్నో తగాదాలు ఘర్షణలు సంభవిస్తాయి, అప్పుడు (rioting) జరుగుతవని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను కనుక ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులేవి ఏర్పడకముందే దీనిని అన్ని చోట్లకు వర్తింపజేస్తేనే దీనియొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము నెరవేరుతుంది. తరువాత ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము రైతయొక్క హక్కును బలపరచి రైతుకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వాలని అనుకోన్నప్పుడు, దానికి తగిన సౌకర్యాలు ఈ బిల్లులో కలుగజేయవలసియుంటుంది. ఈ బిల్లు ఇప్పుడున్న ప్రకారం రైతుల హక్కులను సరిగా బలపరచకపోగా వంటలో వారికిచ్చిన భాగము కూడ చాలా తక్కువ 40 శతాంశము మాత్రము భాగమే వారికి కలుగ

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [3rd December 1952]

జేశారు. ఇది రైతులకు అంత ప్రోత్సాహకరముగా ఉండదు. వంటిలో ఎక్కువ భాగము ఖాస్వాముల కివ్వడమే కాకుండా ఆ పాలమునుంచి వచ్చే గడ్డిని గూడా ఆధిక భాగము ఖాస్వాములకే ఇవ్వాలని అంటున్నారు. ఈ ప్రకారంగా ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, ఇంక రైతులకేమి గిట్టుతుందో, వారికి ఏమి ప్రోత్సాహముండగలదో ఊహించుకోవచ్చును. అంతేకాకుండా అనేక చోట్ల గుంటూరు క్రిష్ణా జిల్లాలోను, మరయు విశాఖ జిల్లాలోను చూపినట్లయితే చాలా పాలాలు అగ్రహారాలు క్రిందికి రావడం లేదు, లేక పోతే ఖాముల క్రిందికి రావడం లేదు మొత్తము మీద అక్కడ ఉన్న రైతాంగం తరతరాలుగా ఆ పాలాల మీద పనిచేస్తున్నారు. అటువంటి రైతాంగాన్నంతా ఈ నాడు పాలమునుండి వెళ్లగొట్టడం జరుగుతుంది. అటువంటిప్పుడు, మీరు ఇకముందు ఎప్పుడో వారికి హక్కు ఇస్తామంటే, అప్పటిలోగా ఎంతమంది రైతులను ఖాములనుండి తరిమివేయడం జరుగుతుందో వారి స్థితిగతులు అప్పటివరకు ఏమి గావాలి? ఆ పోయినటువంటి ఖాములను మరల వారికి ఇవ్వగలరా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఒక సారి ఖామినుండి తొలగింపబడిన తర్వాత అతనికి హక్కు పోయిందని చివరకి దిక్కులేనివానిగా చేసివేస్తారు. వారిని రివిన్యూ మంత్రి శ్రీ మాణిక్యవేలు నాయకరుగారుకాని ముఖ్య మంత్రి శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారుకాని రక్షించగలరా, వారి బిడ్డలగతి, వారి కుటుంబ స్థితి, వారి హక్కుస్థితి విచారించగలరా తరతరాలుగా, ఎవ్వ సమవత్తాలుగా ఆ పాలములో పనిచేస్తూ ఉండినటువంటి tenants ను ఈ రోజు వెళ్లగొట్టడం జరుగుతున్నదంటే, వారికి ఇప్పుడు రక్షణ ఇవ్వకుండా ఎప్పుడో ముందివ్వటామంటే ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్య మెట్లు నెరవేరుకో నాకు బాధపడడంలేదు. ఎప్పుడైతే తంజావూరు జిల్లాకుమాత్రమే ఈ బిల్లు వర్తింపజేయబడుతుందో, అప్పుడు మిగతా ప్రాంతాలలోని ఖాస్వాములు తప్పకుండా వారి tenants ను ఖాములనుండి తొలగించి వారికి ఏలాటి హక్కులు లేకుండా చేయడం జరుగుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లు ఇతర జిల్లాలలో ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులు తీవ్రతరము చేయుటకే సహాయపడుతుందని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ఈ విధంగా tenants కు ఎవ్వ కష్టపడ్డారు సాధించిన తరువాత ఎవ్వ తగాదాలకు గురియై పాలములనుండి తరిమివేయబడిన తరువాత ఈ బిల్లు ఆ ప్రాంతములలో అమలుజరిపిస్తూ ప్రయోజనముండదు. అప్పటికి ఖాస్వాములంతా తమ హక్కులను భద్రపరుచుకొని ఉంటారు. కనుక ఈ బిల్లును ఇప్పుడు అమలు జరుపకపోయినట్లయితే దీనిలో ఉన్నటువంటి ఉద్దేశ్యము ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు ఏమాత్రము నెరవేరకోగా ఇప్పుడున్న సాంప్రదాయక హక్కులగూడ tenants కు లేకుండా పరిస్థితులు తీవ్రతరం చేయుటకే ఇది రోడ్డుతుంది. ప్రస్తుతము తంజావూరులో అటువంటి క్షిప్రపరిస్థితులు సంభవించి యుండిన మాట నిజమే. అక్కడ ఇటువంటి చట్టము అమలు జరపడం అవసరమే కాని వేరే ప్రాంతాలయొక్క పరిస్థితులగూడ అదే సందర్భములూ గుర్తించి అక్కడగూడ tenants కు ఇటువంటి రక్షణ ఇవ్వవలసియుంటుంది. అట్లు గాకుండా తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ఇప్పుడు విషమ పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయి. ఖాస్వాములకు, కాలదార్లకు పోరాటాలు జరిగాయి. కనుక ఆ జిల్లాకొరకే ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొని వచ్చాము. ఇతర జిల్లాలలోగూడ ఇటువంటి విషమ పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడితేనేగాని ఇటువంటి పోరాటాలు జరిగితేనేగాని ఈ బిల్లును అంతవరకు అక్కడికి తీసుకొని రాము, అనేటటువంటి attitude దృక్పథము సరియైంది కాదని దాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము మార్చుకోవలసియున్నదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. లేకపోయినట్లయితే, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో అనేక ఘర్షణలు, పోరాటాలు జరిగి, అప్పుడు మీరు అక్కడికి పోతుంటే పంపించి,

3rd December 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

riotings జరిగి, disorder ఏర్పడవలసిన కోరుతున్నావా. అదంతా సంఘవిచిత్ర తప్పదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. మరియు ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క scope ను extend చేయకపోతే, మీరు వివిధంగా tenants కు హక్కు ఇస్తున్నారు. వారికి మీరు ఏమి రక్షణ ఇస్తున్నారని అడుగుచున్నాను. కుంభి మంత్రిగారిని, రివిన్యూ మంత్రి గారిని మా ప్రాంతాలకు వచ్చి పరిస్థితులు వివిధంగా ఉన్నాయో వచ్చి చూడమని అడుగుచున్నాను. Tanjore Ordinance pass చేసిన తరువాత ఎంతమంది tenants ను భూస్వాములు తరిమివేస్తున్నారు, వారికి ఎంత అన్యాయము జరుగు తున్నది చూడగలరు. అటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో మీద చెతులకు ఈమాదిరి అన్యాయము అక్రమము జరుగుచుండగా, వారికి ప్రభుత్వము ఈ రోజు ఏమి రక్షణ ఇస్తున్నదని అడుగుచున్నాను. కనుక గాట్లరులో మొత్తంగా కొలుదారులందరికీ, మీద రైతు లందరికీ న్యాయము, రక్షణ కలుగజేయవలసినట్లు, సంవత్సరముల తరబడి కష్టపడి పనిచేసినటువంటి పాలముమీద వారికి హక్కు కలుగజేయవలసినట్లు, ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క scope ను extend చేస్తూ, ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే కాకుండా ఇతర చోట్ల నన్నిటికి కూడా దీనిని వర్తింపజేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. అప్పుడే ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము నెరవేరుతుందిగాని, ఈ బిల్లు ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపముతో ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు చాలా ప్రమాదకరమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The House will now rise and meet again at 3 p.m.”

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday I could not be present here because of the unprecedented cyclone that occurred in Tanjore, without notice perhaps to the Government and, of course, with notice to us. On the 30th morning at about 6 o'clock the weather was stormy in Tanjore and nobody thought that it would take such a turn. Towards the evening it was so bad that the people suffered a lot. Till the day before yesterday I tried my level best and even yesterday I thought of going to Tiruchi and catching the plane for Madras even though people said that the weather was bad. In view of these circumstances, I could not come here yesterday. In my absence the whole Bill has been passed and I do not know what amendments have been accepted and what amendments have been rejected. I can only presume that everything has been rejected. Now, before the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is passed into law, this cyclone has wrought havoc in Tanjore. For about 20 hours this was going on. I heard, when I was a young boy, of some such thing as cyclone. Some time back I heard about a cyclone in Andhra Desa. I happened to be the District Secretary of the Andhra Cyclone Relief Committee and I was able to collect large amounts. This time I have to collect amounts for the benefit of people of my own place and I have to appeal to others, not only to the Government but also to others. I have heard about some such thing as cyclone when I attended some cinema. This time I actually heard that sound and I saw in front of me Calicut tiles flying like kites.”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“In the cinema!”

[3rd December 1952]

3-10
p.m.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“ It happened in my own place, Sir. Many houses and huts have been destroyed. Thousands of people have been rendered homeless. (Interruption.) The Hon. the Chief Minister wants me to accept the Bill at once. How can I accept it at once in the light of what happened in Tanjore the day before yesterday? I appeal to the Government to treat Tanjore in a better way. There is no train from Tanjore to Mayuram. The railway line is all right but there is no telegraphic communication. However I was able to catch a train at Tanjore at about 3 o'clock and reach Mayuram last night at about 10-30. I took so much time to cover a distance of 50 miles or so. In the Nagapattinam line, one train capsized. Again, a big tree fell on the line before another train and the driver had to bring back the train. When he was doing so, one of the trees fell on the last carriage which was damaged. In Tanjore town itself, the District Collector and other officials tried to go round the various streets, but they could not do it as many trees had fallen on the road thus obstructing traffic. Yesterday, an urgent meeting was called for and the Collector was presiding over the meeting.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member is referring to the cyclone in Tanjore district. How does he connect it with the Bill before this House? ”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“ This is the connection, Sir. I want to point out that the present state of affairs in the Tanjore district is such and we are applying this Bill to that district. In that connection, we must know the havoc done to that district as a result of the recent cyclone, and to what amount of suffering the poor people of that district have been put. Now we are going to put into effect the provisions of this Bill for the benefit of those poor people. There was no rain at all. If there had been heavy rain, the havoc would have been greater. There was only the strong wind and gale that worked havoc. People could not go out for the whole day. Luckily for us, it was a Sunday and that too happened in day time. If it had happened during night or during day time on a working day when children might have gone to schools, then the casualties would have been greater. Most of the municipal school buildings in Tanjore have collapsed. Very many shops have collapsed. The Collector was telling me the other day that he was not able to move within the municipal limits and so he did not know the conditions obtaining in villages. Actually, none of them was able to move out of the municipal limits. I am told that in Nagapattinam, people experienced very great difficulty. The cyclone started in Nagapattinam. The Collector told me that some wireless message was received from Nagapattinam asking him to send some kerosene oil, maida and other things. But he could not send those things to Nagapattinam unless there was some aeroplane to carry them to that place. There is no possibility of taking these things to Nagapattinam by any other means. The District Medical Officer was telling that the hospital at Nagapattinam also collapsed, and that there was about 10 feet of water there. I asked him as to

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

what happened to the patients in that hospital. He said that he did not know anything about that, but they might have been removed to some other place. The fact is that he is not aware of the correct position. The officials are not able to ascertain the real damages in the villages. This is the state of affairs in the Tanjore district. As I said already, many of the tiles have been carried away and every person has been affected very badly."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" On a point of order, Sir. While we sympathise with those who have suffered from the recent cyclone, the scope of the Bill is very limited and I don't think it has any connexion with the Bill before the House."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" I have already replied to the Hon. Speaker that as the subject-matter of the present Bill is Tanjore and as we are at the third reading of the Bill, it is but fair and proper that we should take into account what happened in that district day before yesterday.

" Sir, even to-day, I am not convinced about the definition of the term 'cultivating tenant'. Even now, middlemen may come and claim that they are also cultivating tenants. If the matter is taken to court and if the court also says that the middlemen also come within the definition of 'cultivating tenant' then many tenants will be affected. The chief defects of the Bill continue to be there. For example, 'who is to harvest and who is to take the initiative?' All these difficulties will arise when the Act is actually put into force. Yesterday, before I started for Madras, a number of tenants came to me and expressed their difficulties. In a particular village, it seems, kuruvai harvest was over and paddy was on the threshing floor and the mirasdars were refusing to measure. When the matter was taken to Revenue Court, the mirasdars, it seems, told the Court that the tenants had carried away a portion of the produce after harvest without their knowledge. The tenants told me, 'Sir, the Revenue Court wants us to produce accounts for the last three years and if the accounts are not produced, the case will not be decided in our favour. Are we to keep accounts for three years? How is it possible for us, poor people, to keep accounts?' This is what they told me. The Chief Minister refused to give jurisdiction to District Courts to entertain revision petitions. He was very strong on this point, and in his anxiety to reject our plea, he said so many things against the Judiciary also. The Government do not have that much of confidence in the Judiciary as they have in the Revenue Courts.

" Sir, there is another difficulty. How are we to find out the total gross produce? Gross produce includes the yield obtained at the poradi. They do not have poradi immediately. If the relationship between the tenant and the mirasdar is not cordial, there will be lot of difficulty in this regard. Trouble will arise as to who is to take the initiative to have poradi and on what date it should be had and on what day the tenant and the mirasdar should share the produce and all that. All these difficulties will arise when the Bill is actually put into force. Of course, the Chief Minister says that

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [3rd December 1952]

he will look into these things and do the needful. He also says that there are the General Clauses Act and other Acts and the Government can also issue executive orders and rectify any wrong that may be committed. With all respect to the Chief Minister, I may state that so long as the present Chief Minister continues to be in office, everything will be all right and he can also claim that everything will go on well. But when a legislation of this type is brought forward, we have to consider so many other things. The present Chief Minister cannot be expected to be in office for ever and the moment another person takes up office, this Bill will be a weapon in his hands and much havoc will be done. It is in this light we have to carefully look into the several loopholes that are there in this Bill. These points should be carefully considered and we must see that there are no loopholes left. The way in which the Bill has been rushed through clearly shows that the Government are very anxious to push through this measure. Probably they have not taken into account the fact that much difficulty will be experienced by the poor peasants for whose benefit this Bill is intended. Therefore, I submit that it is not at all proper for the Government to push through this legislation which is imperfect."

3-20
P.m.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are in the third reading stage of this Bill after having gone through nearly three days of discussion over the various amendments that were moved. In the course of the discussion of some of these amendments, the Hon. the Chief Minister stated that he was surprised—I am not quoting his exact words; I am giving the import of what he said—at the opposition to some of the provisions of the Bill from us. At one time, he said that it was more or less what I myself had demanded in the last session of the Assembly when we discussed the Budget. He added: 'You mentioned during the Budget session about the Mayuram Agreement and the Mannargudi Award; you mentioned a number of other things and I have incorporated them all in this Bill. And despite all this, you people are opposing some of the provisions of the Bill'. Sir, I would, first of all make it clear that this Bill does not contain what we asked for. Let me clear a doubt, whether it is born out of misunderstanding or out of short memory. In the last session of the Assembly, I never demanded that the Mayuram Agreement must form the basis of any piece of agrarian legislation. I never demanded that the Mannargudi Award of 1946 should form the basis of such a legislation either. What transpired in that session was this. We had repeatedly pointed out to the Government that the situation on the agrarian front was worsening day after day and that particularly after the publication of the Subrahmaniam Committee's report, cases of eviction were on the increase. Cases of eviction throughout the State not only with reference to the Tanjore district but other districts also were brought to the notice of the Government. District after district—in Andhradesa, in Malabar and in Tamil Nad—reported a number of evictions. During the course of the debate on the various items of the Budget, the Hon. the Minister for Finance repeatedly stated that the agrarian problem was the

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

thing on which they were concentrating their 'immediate' attention, to the exclusion of all other subjects. Therefore, he assured us that we might rest assured that an agrarian legislation would be brought in covering the entire State. It was in that connexion, I repeatedly said to the Hon. the Chief Minister: 'Well, you may go on cogitating about agrarian reforms; but in the meantime, people are being evicted in large numbers; why not you first of all issue an Ordinance to prevent eviction and to reinstate all those people that have been evicted?' That was specifically pointed out and that was the pointed request that was made by me as well as other Members here.

" Secondly, when I mentioned about the Mayuram Agreement or the Mannargudi Award, I pointed out that it was the landlords and not the tenants who had been repeatedly breaking the Award, violating the Agreement and going back on the solemn agreements that had been entered into. Therefore, when the Government charge the peasantry in Tanjore and other places that they are on the war path, they forget that the landlords go on evicting the tenants and subjecting them to all difficulty. Instead of taking action against such landlords, the Government take action against the peasantry. This is the specific point that I made then and make now. Therefore, it is not correct for anybody to say that we had demanded the incorporation of the provisions of the Mayuram Agreement or the Mannargudi Award into a Bill. But, nonetheless, we do not want to go back on the Mayuram Agreement and the Mannargudi Award. I want to make it clear that no wrong interpretation should be put on what I said. We had demanded a legislation for the whole State so that the situation might ease and that such a legislation should not be on the grounds of disturbances but should be on the basis of justice and equity. Is it not correct, is it not right and is it not just that I took the position I did especially when other people—the Congress committees inclusive—demanded justice to be rendered to the tenants and the peasants? Therefore, to bring forward this Bill which covers only Tanjore—apart from its merits—on the floor of the Legislature is a breach of promise that was made by the Government. I make this definite charge. It is a breach of promise. I had expected in the course of the debate on this Bill itself, when Member after Member raised this question, that one of the Ministers would come forward with an assurance that they were thinking of bringing in legislation for the whole State. Even that assurance has not been forthcoming. Therefore, I make bold to say that this is a breach of promise. The reason that is trotted out for confining this Bill to Tanjore district is that conditions there are peculiar. I would like to point out that it is not an excuse that can stand because agrarian conditions in Tanjore are not peculiar to that district. There is a general misunderstanding that the system of land tenure in Tanjore, namely, the pannaial system, is something peculiar there and that the other districts have got an entirely different system of tenure. It may be that the pannaial might be peculiar to Tanjore

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

but there are other aspects to this question. For example, the tenancy system is not something peculiar to it. Apart from that, there is also the question that the entire Tanjore district is not under wet cultivation. There are places like Pattukkottai and Arantangi where cotton is grown, tobacco is grown and such other things like chillies and other commercial crops are grown. The same is the case with Coimbatore, Tinnevely or Madurai. It is true, however, that in the Tanjore district, by virtue of the fact that it happens to be a deltaic district, the major portion of land is under wet cultivation. That does not mean that there is no wet cultivation in other districts. The same system of tenure obtains in all places. You may call it by different names. In Tanjore you call it *waram* and in Tinnevely you call it *pattam*. The nomenclature might change but the same system, namely, *waram* or *kuthagai*, obtains throughout. Therefore, to say that because conditions in Tanjore were peculiar and therefore a law had to be enacted affecting that particular place cannot at any rate hold water. What is it that the Government have made? In the Preamble to the Bill, they say that in Tanjore alone the relations between landowners and their agents and pannaiyals had become strained. Sir, we sought to move an amendment to the Preamble but unfortunately that was not accepted. The Preamble says :

‘Whereas in the district of Tanjore the relations between landowners and their agents on the one hand and Tenants and farm labourers on the other had become strained, resulting in displacement of tenants . . . and agrarian crimes and disturbances.’

So, are we to draw the conclusion that here is a Government which will move only when there are agrarian crimes and disturbances? Inevitably, I would like to point out, this is the sort of interpretation that is likely to be put on the very Preamble. People would think that only when there are agrarian crimes and disturbances the Government will think of effectively intervening and doing something which will alleviate distress. That is why, we want the Government to change their attitude. Let them not think that an agrarian legislation covering the whole State will be most urgently needed only when the situation in the State worsens.

3-30 P.m. “There are certain other things in the Bill. What is it that this Bill seeks to give to the tenants? There are three things that the Bill seeks to guarantee. Firstly, security of tenure for the tenants for a period of five years. Secondly, a certain amount of share in the produce. Thirdly, as far as the pannaiyal is concerned certain regulated wages. These are the three specific things that are sought to be conferred upon the peasants by this Bill. As has already been pointed out by me, the main thing is that with regard to the share which is fixed in the Bill, it will not satisfy a majority of the tenants in the district. As far as the wages are concerned we are not making any quarrel, because we ourselves realize that to-day in a number of cases where pannaiyals are engaged by small landowners and the tenants themselves, it would be difficult under the existing conditions, agrarian and economic, for these people to pay any higher wages. We never sought to move any amendment

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

with regard to the Schedule because we felt it was a thing that we agreed to. The Mayuram Agreement is a fair one considering the conditions in the district.

“ But, with regard to the main problem, the question of sharing the produce and the question of tenure, on which the bitterest struggles have been there in that district, we want once again to emphasise that this Bill cannot guarantee to the tenants the minimum amount of security that is needed for them and secondly, it cannot guarantee to them the minimum amount of money that they would require in order to give their best for improving agriculture and thus increase food production. The other day we demanded that it must be laid down by law that the landlord must be compelled to advance money for the purchase of manures and applying it to the field. It was not for nothing that we said that. After all the Hon. the Chief Minister ought to know that the yield per acre in Tanjore is far less than the yield in other districts. It is not because of the agrarian trouble that the yield is low there. Then why is it less? In Tanjore it cannot be said that after the Kannambadi Dam was built and the Mettur Dam was built the silt does not come through and therefore the yield has fallen. If you take Trichinopoly district, on the banks of the Cauvery you will find that the yield is nearly one and a half times the yield in Tanjore. Why is it so? It is primarily because the landlords in Tanjore have not been paying sufficient attention with regard to the manuring of their fields. I am prepared to prove this fact. For example, chemical manuring of the fields is a rarity. It may be in a few areas, chemical manuring is common. But chemical manuring of the fields has never been predominant in Tanjore district. That is why we insisted on the landlord advancing money to the tenant to purchase chemical manure so that the tenant could easily procure the chemical manure, apply it to the field and increase the yield per acre. This has not been accepted by Government. But experience will teach them the folly of their not accepting it. To-day it is said: ‘ You the Communist agitators and for the purpose of agitation you might say anything ’. But I say, Sir, these are hard realities which cannot be disproved. I am prepared to stand any enquiry to prove it.

“ Since these things have not been accepted, my own feeling is that this Bill will not fulfil the expectations that have been raised by this Bill. It is expected that as a result of this Bill, food production in the Tanjore district will increase tremendously. I am not at all hopeful of that. (Interruption.) Because the main ingredient that is necessary for increasing the food production in that district has not been provided for in this Bill. Even though the landlord does not pay the money for making available the manure, if the Government are prepared to come forward and advance money,—I am not particular that the Government should do this—to the tenants, to purchase chemical manures and then recover the advance from the tenants, I would have absolutely no quarrel. All I am concerned about is that we must help the

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

tenants to purchase chemical manure and apply it to the land to increase the yield. I am not concerned whether the landlord advances the money or the Government. This is an ordinary thing which experience should teach if production had to be increased.

“ With regard to the question whether this measure will really put an end to the disputes that are there in the matter of sharing the produce, as I have said, since the Government have not accepted the principle that there must be a fair and equitable share they will continue. Of course, the Hon. Minister Sri Subramaniam might say, ‘ Mr. Ramamurthi would want the land itself to be taken away by the tenant ’. He himself admitted that it would be an ideal thing. What does he mean when he says, it would be an ideal thing? It is a thing to be desired by everybody. Therefore there is justice in that. If there is injustice, it cannot be ideal. Anyway I do not want to go into that aspect of the question now. Granting that within the framework of the Constitution regarding private property, the land is vested in the hands of the landowner, an equitable share should be assured to the tenants, a share which would be accepted by all people as fair. I have seen the draft of the latest Five-year Plan of the Planning Commission. Even that Commission has recommended that 75 per cent of the produce must be given to the tenants and only 25 per cent made available to the landlord. This is a specific recommendation made therein. I have seen this final draft report recently. When that is the recommendation of the Planning Commission itself, obviously the provision of only 40 per cent for the tenant in the Tanjore district, burdened with all other cultivation expenses, can by no stretch of imagination be called a fair share for the tenant. So long as there is no fairness or equity in this division of the produce, then inevitably people are bound to struggle for justice. Social forces are let loose, they are set in motion, because there is justice behind this social force. They stand for social equality, they stand for social justice. Therefore so long as we do not think in terms of social justice, social equality, we are bound to have these struggles. After all the peasants cannot be blamed for this. This is the one thing that I want to tell the Government. They cannot stop this struggle by means of this Bill. This will continue. The peasants have learnt already that only by means of struggle they can get anything and not by any other means. On that account I am not opposing this Bill. If the Government become wiser as a result of experience and bring forward an amendment to this Bill, well and good. Otherwise, let us wait and see what the peasants themselves will do.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have forgotten to tell the House that from tomorrow the House will meet from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. as the Upper House is also meeting. I must also inform the House that in the third reading of the Bill, speeches should be confined to matters contained in the Bill and no reference should be made to extraneous matters. Now I fix a time-limit of 10 minutes for each Member.”

3rd December 1952]

* SRI R. VENKATA JAGGA RAO :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ చట్టం శంజావూరు జిల్లాకు సంబంధించిన తవరకు కొంతకు కొంతైనా రైతులకు ఉపయోగపడుచున్న చెప్పవచ్చును. అయితే రాష్ట్ర మొత్తమును దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని చూచినచో ఈ చట్టం వల్ల హెచ్చు ప్రాంతాలలోని కొలదార్లకు నష్టదాయకంగా పరిణమించినదని చెప్పవలసింది. శంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని కొలదార్లకు, పాలేరుకు రక్షణకలుగజేస్తూ వినాడు ఆ రైసెన్సు పాస్ చేయబడినచో ఆ నాటినుంచీ కూడా ఇతర జిల్లాలోని ఖాస్సాములు తమకు కూడా ఇట్టి ఆర్డినెన్సు ఏడుగులలోనైనా రావచ్చుననే భయంతో, కొలదార్లను అవతలకు నెట్టివేయడం ప్రారంభించారు. ముఖ్యంగా మా పీఠాపురం తాలూకాలో అప్పుడే పెద్ద ఖాస్సాములు, అంటే వందలకొలది ఎకరాలు ఉన్న ఖాస్సాములు తమ ఖాములనుండి కొలదార్లను అవతలకు నెట్టివేయడం నేను ప్రత్యక్షంగా చూశాను. అందుచేత ఈ చట్టం ఒక్క శంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేయడంవల్ల ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని ఖాస్సాములందరినీ, ఇటువంటి చట్టం చేబోతున్నాం కనుక, మీరంతా బాగైత పడండి అని హెచ్చరించినట్లు పరిణమించినదని చెప్పవలసి ఉంది. శంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని రైతులకు కలుగ జేసిన సదుపాయాలను ఇతర జిల్లాలలోని కొలదార్లకు వెంటనే గలుగజేయరహితం చాలా శోచనీయమైన విషయం. ఎట్టి అలస్యం లేకుండా ఇటువంటి చట్టాన్ని రాష్ట్రం మొత్తంగా వర్తింప జేస్తారని తద్వారా మన రాష్ట్రంలోని కొలదార్ల కందరినీ రక్షణ కలుగ జేస్తారని ఆశించినవారి కందరినీ ఆశాభంగమైనదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ చట్టాన్ని ఒక్క జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేసి ఇతర జిల్లాలోని కొలదార్లకు వర్తింపజేయకపోవడం న్యాయంగా లేదని కూడా ప్రభుత్వంవారి దృష్టికి తీస్తున్నాను.

“ అంతే కాకుండా ఈ చట్టంలో పల్లయార్లకు నిర్ణయించిన హాలి రేటు కూడా చాలా తక్కువగా ఉన్నది. ఈ రేటు కనీస వేతనానికన్న కూడా చాలాకష్టంగా ఉన్నదని చెప్పుటకు విచారిస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయము చట్టంలో ఉన్న క్లాజులో లోపాలన్నింటికీ ముఖ్యంగా ఒక లోపము వున్నది. అది యిది. పల్లయార్లకు నిర్ణయించిన హాలి రేటు కనీస వేతనమే, లేక గరిష్ట ప్రమాణమే సరిగా నిర్ణయించబడలేదు. పల్లయార్లకు అంతకన్న తక్కువ హాలి రేటు ఇవ్వరాదని నిర్దిష్టంగా ఎట్టి provision బిల్లలో లేదు. అందువల్ల పల్లయార్ల హెచ్చు హాలి రేటు అడుగుటకు హక్కు ఉన్నదో లేదో తెలియదు లేదు. రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు ఈ విషయాన్ని స్పష్టపరుస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను. చట్టంలో హాలి రేటు, మగవానికి రెండు మరక్కాలు, స్త్రీకి ఒక మరక్కా చొప్పున నిర్ణయించబడింది. ఇది చాలా తక్కువ హాలి అనిమాత్రం మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ తక్కువ హాలితో వాళ్లు సంసారం గడవడం చాలా కష్టం. దీనికి తోడు వారికి పని ఉన్న రోజులలోనే ఈ హాలి ఇవ్వబడుతుంది. పని లేని రోజులలో హాలి ఇవ్వరు. ఇది చాలా అన్యాయమని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. పల్లయార్ల అనే వ్యక్తి మా జిల్లాలోని పాలికాపుటపడివాడని నా అధిప్రాయం. అట్టివానికి సంవత్సరం పాడుగున జీతం ఇవ్వడం మా జిల్లాలో అనాది నీర్తిగా వస్తున్న ఆచారం. కాని ఈ చట్టంలో ఇతర జిల్లాలోని పాలికాపుట కలిగి ఉన్న సదుపాయాలను కూడా శంజావూరు పల్లయార్లకు కలుగజేయక పోవడం శోచనీయమైన విషయం.

“ అంతే కాకుండా, ఇటువంటి చట్టం వస్తుందని ఖాస్సాములు 1949 వ సంవత్సరంలో తెలుసుకొనిన దగ్గరనుంచి కొలదార్లను తొలగించి చేస్తున్నారు. అనేక సందర్భాలలో కొలదార్లకు ఖాస్సాములు కొలు ముచ్చికకాలు ఇవ్వడం లేదు. వాతమూలకంగా కొలదార్లు ఖామిని సాగు చేస్తున్నట్లు ఎట్టి ఆధారాలు లేకుండా

[Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao] [3rd December 1952]

చేయబడుతున్నాయి. ఈ విషయమై అధికారులు చాలా శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొనవలసి ఉంది. వ్రాతపూరితంగా ఉన్న రికార్డులనే నమ్ముతామంటే అనేకమంది రైతులు తొలగించి వేయబడే ప్రమాదం ఉంది. కాబట్టి ఒక్క రికార్డుల బట్టే కాకుండా, ప్రభుత్వం నియమించే కమిటీలవారు యదార్థ విషయాలను వాచుకునే సెలెక్షన్ కొనవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. పెద్ద పెద్ద ఖాన్వాసులు కౌలుదార్లకు వ్రాతపూరితంగా ఏ కాగితం ఇవ్వరు. ఈ విషయాన్ని గుర్తించి అధికారులు ఒక్క రికార్డులను బట్టే తీర్పులు ఇవ్వకుండా చూడవలసిన అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“ఈ శాసనాన్ని ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు పరిమితం చేయరని, త్వరగా రాష్ట్రమంతటికీ దానిని వర్తింపజేస్తారని, కనీసం కొందరికైనా ప్రస్తుతం ఉపయోగం కలుగుతుందని ఉద్దేశపడుతూ దీనిని నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

3-40
p.m.

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, when Hon. Minister rises to reply to this debate, he may twit the members of the Opposition. It is true that there have been some Members in the Opposition who, while vehemently opposing and criticising the Bill, at the same time pleaded for the extension of its application to the rest of the State. To my mind such an approach by some Members of the Opposition appears to be somewhat legitimate, for it is due to the fact that the present Bill like the curate's egg is good in some parts though perhaps bad on the whole. What does this Bill seek to achieve? It seeks to achieve some immediate as well as some ultimate objectives. First of all the Bill seeks to provide some security of tenure for the tenant and a guaranteed wage for the pannaial. It is this particular aspect of the Bill which seems to be welcomes by one and all. But with regard to the other aspects of the Bill, viz., fixing the share of the produce, there has been no such agreement and no such welcome on the part of the Opposition Benches. The Bill fixes a certain minimum share of the produce for the tenant. It fixes a minimum wage, if we can call it a wage, for the pannaial. Even this temporary security of tenure and security of wages is set against the loopholes left for eviction on the one hand and dismissal on the other.

“Let me come to the clauses dealing with disputes arising between the pannaial and the landlord and the consequent denial of appeals to courts of law. As one who is well-acquainted with this aspect, as one who has had experience of industrial tribunals, as a person who has followed the trade union movement very closely and last of all as one who has argued before the industrial tribunals for the reinstatement of dismissed workers, I can with some authority say that it is only the employers, in most cases, who take cases to the High Courts and sometimes to the Supreme Court also. In a majority of cases, the disputes are settled in the ordinary tribunals. To that extent I think that the bar on the jurisdiction of the civil courts envisaged in the Bill is particularly welcome. But, what is to happen in case any victimization of the pannaial takes place? Suppose the pannaials form themselves into an organization for the betterment of their lot and demand certain concessions for bettering

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

their conditions of service and security of tenure. It is but natural to expect victimization of the pannaiyals. This may constitute a grave danger to the security of service of the pannaiyals. What does the Bill provide to meet such an exigency? Unless some rules are framed by Government, which they of course are empowered to frame under the Bill, the whole administrative machinery will not be able to prevent such a victimization. The administrative machinery may tend even to encourage such victimization. But the recourse to a judiciary bred in the traditions of freedom of contract will not provide the sought for remedy. Only militancy and organized strength can thwart such victimization.

“ Now, let me come to the ultimate objectives which the Bill seeks to pursue. The Hon. the Chief Minister issued a statement which is contained in the little pamphlet that has been given to us and which is entitled. ‘ A Fair Deal to the Tanjore Ryots ’. The Hon. the Chief Minister in one of his addresses to the mirasdars of the Tanjore district observed as follows :— ‘ Production should be your aim. Unless you give the tiller of the soil sufficient interest in cultivation, production cannot be improved. I am not advising you to give away the land to the cultivators. It is to prevent such a calamity that I have brought in this Ordinance ’. Therefore, we see that there are two ultimate objectives in this Bill. First that production should be increased as a result of the implementation of the Bill and the other to avert the danger of the land passing into the possession of the tiller. This second objective comes from the Hon. the Chief Minister who is supposed to be the pillar of the Congress Party which has categorically stated that its objective is ‘ land to the tiller of the soil ’. I cannot understand, Sir, how an important and leading member of the Congress Party, in direct contradiction to the stated objective of the party, can say that the land going to the tiller of the soil is a calamity and that such a calamity should be prevented by bringing in this particular piece of legislation. If this is the ultimate objective of this Bill, Sir, then I would submit that this Bill which attempts to stave off what may be called a revolution by this minor reform, is wholly reactionary and the concession of certain security of tenure to the tenant and certain guaranteed wage to the pannaiyal is only a minor concession.

“ Then, Sir, let us come to the other objective. It is supposed to increase production. I submit, Sir, that the present sharing of the crop will not act as an incentive to higher production. What does the Bill contemplate? The Bill lays down very clearly that two-fifths of the gross produce would go to the tenant and it also lays down in categorical terms the duties that are cast upon the tenant. The tenant is supposed to provide for the ordinary expenses of cultivation; he is supposed to incur expenditure in regard to manure and seed paddy; he is expected to maintain the water channels. So, Sir, if we take all these items of expenditure and if we also take the net produce after deducting all legitimate items of expenditure, then, I submit, the maximum that would be left to the tenant under this piece of legislation will only be approximately 20 per cent of the net produce. If 20 per cent is going to be given

3-50
p.m.

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [3rd Decem̄ber 1952]

to the man who by the sweat of his brow works for increased production, I submit, with the authority on the subject of tenancy legislation not only in this country but in other countries also, there will certainly be no incentive for increased production. There are countries where Governments have given artificial manure and guaranteed a price for the produce. In places where the tenant's share has been as low as laid down in the Bill and where he has been given manure, the tenant has tended to sell away that manure rather than use it for the purpose of increasing production. If as a result of his own efforts the tenant should increase production by hundred per cent, we must assume that the total amount of expenditure that will be incurred in producing that extra amount of yield should be much more than usual. But what is promised to the tenant under this Bill? We assure him a bare 10 per cent of the increased net produce! The Bill is therefore a dis-incentive to increased production. We may welcome this measure to the extent that there is some measure of security provided to the tenant and the pannaial. But let us be very clear with regard to the ultimate objective. It is my submission that the ultimate objective, viz., increased production, will not be subserved by this Bill and that it will run counter to the prevailing trends in tenancy and agrarian reform."

* SRI C. KANDASWAMI :—"கனம் சபா நாயகர் அவர்களே, தஞ்சாவூர் பண்ணையான் குடியானவர்கள் பாதுகாப்பு சட்டம் இப்பொழுது இறுதி கட்டத்தில் வந்து சட்டமாகப் போகிறது. அதைப்பற்றி சிலவார்த்தைகள் பொதுப்படையாகச் சொல்லுவதற்கு நான் முன் வந்துள்ளேன். தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு சூழ்நிலை சமீப காலமாக ஏற்பட்டுள்ளது. அதற்கு நீண்ட கால சரித்திரம் இருந்த போதிலும் இந்த வருஷம் சாகுபடி ஆரம்பத்தில் ஒரு நெருக்கடியான கட்டம் வந்தது. அதன் காரணமாக இந்த சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது என்பது எல்லோரும் அறிந்த விஷயம். இந்த சட்டத்தைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் இந்த சபையின் அங்கத்தினர்களுடைய நோக்கங்கள் யார் யாருடையது எப்படி இருந்த போதிலும் கூட இன்றைய தினம் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் விவசாயத்திற்கு ஏற்பட்டுள்ள நெருக்கடியை சமாளிப்பதற்காக அரசாங்கம் முன்வந்து இந்த சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்து நிறைவேற்றப் போகிறது. அதே சமயத்தில் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் எவ்வளவு தூரம் இந்த நெருக்கடியை சமாளிக்க முடியும், அது எவ்விதம் பயனடையப் போகிறது, எப்படி நெருக்கடியை தீர்க்க முடியும் என்பதை யெல்லாம் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். அங்கு ஏற்பட்ட நெருக்கடியின் காரணமாகவும் அதுவும் நெடுங்காலமாக ஏற்பட்டு வருவதாலும் அதை சமாளிக்க ஒரு திட்டவாட்டமான ஒரு சட்டம் வேண்டும் என்பதற்காகவே இந்த சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டது. அங்கு நீண்ட காலமாக ஏற்பட்டு வந்த ஒரு நெருக்கடியை சமாளிப்பதற்கும், அந்த நெருக்கடியால் நாட்டில் ஏற்பட்ட பஞ்சம், பசி, பட்டினி முதலியவைகளை தடுக்கவேண்டுமென்ற ஒரு கருத்தை மனதில் கொண்டும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஏதாவது நல்ல ஏற்பாட்டை செய்யவேண்டும் என்பதற்காகவும், அதற்காக நில சீர்திருத்தம் அவசியம் என்பதற்காகவும் இந்த சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. காங்கிரஸ் மகாநாட்டில் கூட காரிய கமிட்டி ஒரு ஐந்து வருஷ திட்டத்தைப் போன்று பல விஷயங்களையெல்லாம், குடியானவர்களுக்கு நிலம் கிடைப்பதைப் பற்றி, பேசிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதனால் மக்களுக்கு எவ்வளவு சௌகரியங்கள் ஏற்படும் என்பதைப் பற்றி சொல்ல வேண்டாம். அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்களை நீனைத்துக் கொண்டும் அவர்களுடைய தலைவிதி என்ன வென்பதை சிந்தித்துக் கொண்டும் அவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் இந்த சட்டத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பார்க்கும் போது ஏதோ ஓரளவிற்கு தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவின், நிலைமையை திட்டவாட்டமாக வரையறுக்க கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது என்பது என்னுடைய

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Kandaswami]

அபிப்பிராயம். அதற்குத் தக்கவாறு நான் சில திருத்தங்களை அனுப்பியிருந்தேன். அந்தத்திருத்தங்கள் அவசியமாக இருந்த போதிலும் அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவில்லை. இப்பொழுது அரசாங்கம் அந்த திருத்தங்களை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும் பின்னாடி அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளும் படியான நிலைமை ஏற்படும் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாமல் இந்த சட்டத்தை நிறைவேற்றியிருப்பது அவ்வளவு சரியானது அல்ல. இதை அடிப்படையாக வைத்துக் கொண்டு பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் பேசும்போது தங்களுடைய ஜில்லாக்களில் நூற்றுக்கு ஐம்பது என்று கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது என்று, இந்த சட்டத்தினால் அங்குள்ள குடியானவர்களுக்கு அது பாதிக்கும் என்றும் சொல்லப்பட்டது. கனம் அங்கத்தினர் முதலையா செட்டியார் அவர்கள் தன்னுடைய ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவைப் பற்றி மிகவும் பெருமையாகச் சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார். ஆனால் என்னைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் ராமனாதபுரத்தைப் பற்றி பேசிக்கொண்டிருப்பதில் அவசியமில்லை. ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து பெருத்த அளவில் விவசாயிகள் தங்களுடைய நிலத்தை விட்டுவிட்டு தங்களுடைய குடிசைகளை காலி செய்து விட்டு ஊர் ஊராகச் சென்று பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு ஜீவனம் பண்ணிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். அந்த அளவில் இருக்கும்போது ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவைப் பற்றி பேச வேண்டியது அவசியமில்லை. அங்குள்ள நிலைமை வேறு. மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களில் நூற்றுக்கு ஐம்பது வீதம் வாரம் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது என்றும் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் அங்கு பாதிக்கும் என்றும் கூறப்பட்டது. அந்தந்த ஊர்களின் வழக்கத்திற்குத் தகுந்தபடி விவசாய சூழ்நிலைக்குத் தக்கபடி வாரம் முதலியவைகள் கொடுக்கவேண்டியது அவசியம் தான். அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் அதிகம் கொடுக்க வேண்டியது அவசியம்தான். அதை ஒத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டியது தான். அந்த நிலைமையில் தஞ்சாவூர் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் குறைந்த பட்சம் வாரம் நூற்பது என்று கணக்கு வைத்துக் கொண்டு அதற்கு மேல் அங்கங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய சூழ்நிலையை அனுசரித்து அங்கு இருப்பதற்கு நூற்றுக்கு இருபது கலம் அதிகமாகக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று நான் ஒரு திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்து அதை வற்புறுத்தி சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டேன். அந்த திருத்தத்தை அரசாங்கம் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவில்லை. இப்பொழுது அதை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும் பின்னாடி அதை சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளும்படியான அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டாலும் ஏற்படும். அவ்விதம் அவசியம் ஏற்படும் என்பது என்னைப் போன்றவர்களுக்கு நன்கு தெரியும்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவாக நிலம் வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறவர்களுக்கு இந்த நிவாரணம் கிடையாது என்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதற்கும் ஒரு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்து அதையும் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளவில்லை. அதனால் என்ன பயன் அடையப் போகிறார்கள் என்பதும் தெரியவில்லை. இதனால் விவசாயிகள் பயன் அடையப் போகிறார்களோ இல்லையோ இதனால் சிறிய மிராச்தாரர்களுக்கும் ஏழை குடியானவர்களுக்கும் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும் மோதல் ஏற்படுத்துவதைத் தவிர வேறு பயன் ஒன்றும் அடையப் போவதில்லை. அதற்கு வேண்டி கொண்டு வரப்பட்ட திருத்தத்தைப் புகுப் கொள்ளப்படவில்லை. பின்னால் அதற்கும் திருத்தம் கொண்டு வரும்படியாக இருக்கும் என்பது தான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக இந்த சட்டத்தை மாகாணம் பூராவிலும் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டும் என்றும் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிற்கு மட்டிலும் என்ன வென்றெல்லாம் கேட்கப்பட்டது. அதைப் பற்றி பல அபிப்பிராயங்களும் சொல்லப்பட்டன. இந்த சட்டத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் பொதுவாக நான்கு விஷயங்களை மாகாணம் பூராவும் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதில் ஒரு விஷயம் பண்ணையாள் என்பது. இது தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிற்குத் தான் பயனுடையதாக இருக்கும். தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவின் பண்ணையாள் முறை வேறு. அந்த முறை மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கு ஒத்ததாக இல்லை. அதற்குத் திருத்தங்கொண்டு வந்து விட்டால் மற்ற விஷயங்கள் எல்லாம் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் பொருந்தும் என்பதில் சந்தேகம் இல்லை. அந்தந்த ஜில்லாவிற்கு தக்கவாறு இந்த சட்டத்திற்கு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்து

[Sri C. Kandaswami] [3rd December 1952]

அதை மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வரலாம். அப் பொழுதுதான் இது பல ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் பொருந்தும். இதை அரசாங்கம் செய்திருக்கலாம். இனிமேலாகிலும் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களைப் பற்றி யோசனை செய்து அங்கும் இதைக் கொண்டுவரலாம் என்று நினைக்கிறேன்.

4 p.m. “ அடுத்தபடியாக இந்த சட்டம் இன்றையதினம் நிறைவேரப்போகிறது. இதிலுள்ள சிலவிஷயங்களினால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு பயன் ஏற்படப்போகிறதோ இல்லையோ அது வேறு விஷயம். அது வேலை செய்யும் விஷயத்தைப் பொருத்திருக்கிறது. இந்த சட்டம் சரியான முறையில் நடைபெறுதபடி இருக்க மிராசதார்கள் பிரயத்தனம் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். சமீபத்தில் மிராசதார்கள் கும்பகோணத்தில் மகாநாடு கூட்டி சில தீர்மானங்கள் நிறைவேற்றி இருக்கிறார்கள். அதை சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த சட்டம் இப்பொழுது இந்த சபையில் சட்டமாகப் போகிறது. அதை அமுல் நடத்தும்போது மிராசதார்கள் இந்த சட்டத்தை எந்த விதத்திலும் பிரயோசனப்படாமல் இருக்கும் படியாகவும் இந்த சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்தப்பட முடியாமலிருப்பதற்கு என்னென்ன செய்ய வேண்டுமோ அதைச் செய்வார்கள். இதை யெல்லாம் செய்வோம் என்று இன்று அந்த மகா நாட்டில் சவால் விட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இதை அரசாங்கத்தின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வருகிறேன். கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இந்த சட்டத்தை போட்டுவிட்டு அந்த ஜில்லாவிற்குப் போன போது அங்குள்ள பெரிய மனிதர்கள் எல்லாம் பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் பெரிய சட்டத்தைப் போட்டு விட்டார்கள், இதைக்கொண்டு வந்து விட்டார்கள் என்று வாழ்த்தினார்கள். அன்று வாழ்த்திய வாய்களெல்லாம் இன்று மௌனம் சாதிக்கின்றன. அவர்களெல்லாம் இந்த சட்டம் பலனடையாமல் செய்ய திட்டமிட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்த முடியாமலிருக்க என்னென்ன செய்ய வேண்டுமோ அதையெல்லாம் செய்வார்கள் என்பதை தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு அதற்கு வேண்டிய ஏற்பாடுகள் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் நான் பேசுவதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் அளித்ததற்கு என்னுடைய வணக்கத்தை தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பிரசங்கத்தை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, we see here universal appreciation of the Bill from all sides of the House, of course with some reservation with reference to certain details from some of the hon. Members of the Opposition. I was very carefully hearing the speech of the hon. Member Sri C. Kandaswami coming from Tanjore. I may say at the outset, though he belongs to the Opposition, he has generally accepted the principles underlying the Bill and has welcomed this measure. But the whole trouble seems to be based on a misconception—I do not mean to put it on any ignorance of facts, but rather on wanton misunderstanding purposely misconceived. The very object of the Bill, everyone knows, is simply to improve certain agrarian conditions which have deteriorated in the sense that of late for the last four or five years the relationship between the landowner and the tenant is getting strained, and there is displacement of tenants. That is the main object. Even during the last elections, everywhere it was stated by the Communist friends that tenants were being evicted on a mass scale in Tanjore district. That was the main grievance of the other side. To see that such a displacement is not allowed any longer and to restore the peaceful conditions and maintain a sort of cordial relationship between the landowner and the tenant, our Revered Rajaji has come forward with great statesmanship and boldness by promulgating an ordinance. In the

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

beginning there was appreciation from the land owning people. But what do we find now? We know the resolutions passed at the mirasdars' conferences at Kumbakonam and Mayuram. Of course, I for the moment do not propose to say that there is much force in the contentions put forward in the resolutions passed at those conferences; but objections have been raised by the landowners against the latest provisions incorporated in the Bill. Of course, criticism is welcome. But criticism for criticism's sake is a thing that cannot be tolerated. But we have to see the provisions that have been newly incorporated in the Bill.

"Incidentally I may also refer to the speech made by the hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam. Just as he came to-day after witnessing the severe storm at Tanjore, he perhaps wanted to depict what exactly took place in Tanjore. It appears to me that it has got a direct bearing on the question we are now discussing on the floor of the House. The situation, that has been created on account of the cyclone has to be seen from the point of view of how we are going to work this Bill when it becomes an Act and fulfil the provisions contained therein. As it is, the relations are already strained. Now, Nature also is against us. There is a storm and there is discontent everywhere. It is all the more reason that we have to work the Act in the spirit in which it is conceived. There is no use picking holes and lacunae here and there and saying that we have not gone far enough and that land reform has not been done in the way in which others would like to have it. There are some customary practices prevailing in the Tanjore district. Now, the tenants have been given 40 per cent and the mirasdars 60 per cent. Originally the tenants were getting only 20 to 25 per cent. Sir, hon. Members of this House barring a few individuals like Mr. P. Ramamurthi and some others may not know the actual conditions prevailing in Tanjore district. Previously the tenants were being given only 20 to 25 per cent and 30 per cent in very rare cases. Now they are given 40 per cent. The complaint is that they are not given 60 per cent. Even with regard to catch crop, they were previously getting 50 per cent. Now the landlord is given only one-fifth and I may even say that it is a pittance from the view point of the landholders. What is the reason for expropriating the landholders' share? Is it not expropriation? I am not holding any brief for the landholders. The amendment fixing 20 per cent to the landlord and 80 per cent to the tenant was moved by the Opposition and accepted by the Government. I only want to show as instance whether such amendments will go to settle the agrarian unrest or whether they will aggravate the disturbances. The Opposition Members also wanted to move amendments to the effect that if a pannaiyal is not reinstated as required by the Conciliation Officer, the landholder should be not only penalized by being made to pay damages, but he should also be imprisoned. Is it the way in which we should look at the problem?"

MR. SPEAKER :—"Let the hon. Member speak on the provisions of the Bill."

[3rd December 1952]

* SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—" Sir, I only wanted to say to what extent our Reverend Rajaji has gone to meet the demands of the tenants. The tenants have been given substantial concessions. Of course, landlords also may have their own grievances. We know how proprietary rights have been conferred on the ryots in inam and zamindari areas by giving ryotwari pattas to the tenants. Similar rights may be conferred on these tenants also."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Many hon. Members want to take part in the third reading also. So I fix a time-limit of five minutes to each Member."

4-10
P.m.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know why the Chair should be so very uncharitable when my chance comes to speak."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Many Members want to speak; it is uncharitable on the part of Members to accuse the Chair."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, belonging as I do to the Opposition, I still venture to congratulate the Government on carrying through this measure; for they have taken the right step in the right direction, though the step is niggardly in scope. Sir, I should have expected the Government to be more liberal in their objective. What are the objectives in the Bill? Though the objectives are laudable to a certain extent, the remedy suggested in the Bill is only moderate in its scope. In the Preamble it is stated that in view of the disturbed conditions prevailing in the Tanjore district, the Government are bringing forward this Bill. Do they expect that such kind of disturbed conditions should prevail in the other districts also so as to enable them to give succour to the suffering tenants in those districts also? Sir, the very word 'pannaiyal' is a degrading one. It is an anti-social term; it is offensive to the decency of any citizen. It amounts to serfdom. Because we did not like the word 'Adi-Dravida', or to be plain, the Tamil word 'pariah', we have introduced a new word 'Harijan'. Such being the case, why do you want to perpetuate a degrading name by means of your legislation? I should have welcomed it if the Government had substituted this word 'pannaiyal' by the term 'agricultural farm labourer'."

(At this stage Sri C. Kandaswami occupied the Chair.)

" As regards general land reforms, a committee was appointed, over which Mr. Subrahmaniam presided, and the suggestions made by that committee were more liberal than the niggardly proposals of the Government to-day. There it was stated that 55 per cent and 45 per cent of the produce should be the shares of the tenant and the landowner. I do not see why our Government should stick to 40 and 60."

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—" Is 'niggardly' parliamentary, Mr. Chairman? "

3rd December 1952]

TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Sri C. Kandaswami):—"It is parliamentary."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, my time is being taken up by the Opposition. (Laughter.) I wish that the landed gentry, like the mirasdar are liquidated instead of being killed inch by inch. I would rather welcome the Government to liquidate that class by even expropriating land or by giving them compensation or even by putting some restriction that so much of extent of land only should be owned by an individual, instead of a person possessing thousands of acres. That would have been more welcome instead of this *laissez faire* policy which is adopted to-day. I would also add that I expect other and better measures, such as one for liquidating the matadhipatis. They are all only absentee landlords; they have no interest in the land, nor in the production of foodcrops on their lands. I therefore suggest that such lands may be brought under co-operative cultivation which has proved successful—not in Russia, because they may not like that example, but—in America, on which country they depend mostly.

"Sir, our Government headed by Rajaji, should take the note of warning that I give them now. They are sitting upon a volcano to-day. The volcano is composed of the mirasdar of the Tanjore district. (Interruption.) No doubt, we are very good friends; but we only want to put them in the proper track. The mirasdar have convened a conference and they have objected to the levy system. They are saying they will even carry on a no-tax campaign against you. Why, they are even organizing to fight the next elections. (At this stage, the Chairman sounded the gong.) One minute, Sir. They feel that their cause is not at present championed properly in this House. So, I am sounding a note of warning in this House that this Bill has got to be worked properly and correctly. We are behind you in carrying out the provisions of this Bill. (Applause.) Sir, the same conditions as in the Tanjore district are obtaining in the Madurantakam taluk of the Chingleput district. If you come to our district and see things for yourself, you will find the conditions are very miserable. So, when you think of extending the scope of this Bill to other areas, please remember Madurantakam."

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM:—"Sir, I must register a strong protest on behalf of my party against the partiality shown towards the Tanjore tenants and against the Government having ignored the agitation that has been carried on for so many years in the other parts of the State, particularly the agitation carried on by this party for the betterment of the conditions of the tenants in the whole State. Sir, this is a very unhappy thing and it casts a gloom in the minds of not only the Members inside the Legislature, but of the people living in all parts of this State. I therefore submit that Government must very soon prepare a Bill comprehensive enough to satisfy the needs of all tenants occupying holdings in all parts of the State. This is the view expressed not only on behalf of the party, but I may say it is the view of all Members who have spoken one after another on this Bill.

[Sri K. V. Ramesam] [3rd December 1952]

"Coming to the merits of the Bill, Sir, I find there is little solace for the tenants even of Tanjore. For instance, the security that is afforded to them is only for five years which is a hardly sufficient period for instilling any enthusiasm or incentive in them to grow more food—which is the main object of this piece of legislation. The attempt on the part of the Opposition to confer occupancy right was unfortunately defeated, and even the amendment which sought to fix a period of ten years was defeated. That shows the mentality of the Government, viz., that they are not for giving proper protection and security of tenure to the tenants.

"Coming to the question of shares, I must say it is a most unfortunate provision that we have made now, so far I can see; for, if a tenant wants to grow more food for the benefit of the entire community, there must be sufficient incentive for him to do it in the shape of his getting a legitimate share of the produce, that is raised. Two-fifths of the total produce is insufficient to create a sufficient incentive in the tenant to grow more food in his holding.

"Then again, the clause relating to eviction is unhappily worded. For instance, greatest power is conferred on revenue officers particularly in the matter of disposing of all applications for eviction. There is a clause giving power to the revenue officers to dispose of such applications summarily. It is really sad to think that an amendment which was sought to be made on behalf of the Opposition for carrying the matter to a district court was negatived. That shows the fear which the present Government have, regarding this aspect of the case. There should be an equal opportunity for both the tenant and the landowner to seek remedy in a civil court, particularly when, as pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, there is generally some difficulty of interpretation only on questions of law in regard to the various clauses; and a provision to that effect should have been incorporated in this Bill.

"Lastly, Sir, let me on behalf of the tenants of the Tanjore district, congratulate the Government on having extended to them at least this much of benefit, and I also appeal to the Government that similar benefits should be extended to the ryots in general in the other areas of the State within a very short period."

4-20
P.m.

* SRI G. SATYANARAYANA :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ Tanjore Tenancy Act ను తీసుకొనివచ్చినప్పుడు రాష్ట్రము మొత్తము అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో కొలుదార్లు అందరకు కూడా వర్తింపజేస్తారని చాలా ఆశతో నిర్దిష్టించుకొనియున్నారు. కాని ఇప్పుడు యీ నాలుగు రోజులనుంచి జరిగినదాన్ని చూస్తే ఇప్పుడు ఎక్కడ సవరణలతో ప్యాను అయిన దానిబట్టి చూస్తే యీ యాక్టు అన్ని ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింప జేయకపోవడము వారిలో చాలా నిరాశపూత్రం కల్పించుతుంది. ఇప్పటికే తంజావూరు Ordinance ప్రకటించినప్పటికీ అనేక జిల్లాలలో యీ కొలుదార్లను తొలగించడం ఆసేబటువంటిది జరిగింది. ఉదాహరణకు రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారి దృష్టికిని, ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారి దృష్టికిని తీసుకొని రాబడినటువంటి విషయమే ఒకటి ఇక్కడ తెలుపుతున్నాను. గత పదిహేను సంవత్సరాలుగా ఒక రైతు భూములను పొగుచేసుకొన్నాడు. ఈ రైతు పొలములలోనే యిల్లు కట్టుకొని పొగు

3rd December 1952] [Sri G. Satyanarayana]

చేసినా ఉన్నాడు. ఆమువంటి రైతును ఆ భూమిలో వేసుకొనియున్న యిట్లను కీకీ వేసి బలవంతముగా ఆ భూములనుండి తొలగించడము జరిగింది. ఈ రైతు యితర రైతుల సహాయముతో ఆ భూమినుండి తొలగకుండా భుండలవనివుతు శాపీసు సహాయంతో భూమినుంచి తొలగించారని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారికి, ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారికి తెలియజరుచుకోవడంకూడ జరిగింది. కాని యంతవరకు దానిపై ఏమి చర్య తీసుకొనలేదు. అదే విధంగా రాష్ట్రములో అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో రైతులను, కాలుదార్లను వరిసగా వెళ్లగొట్టడము జరిగింది. ఈ Tanjore Ordinance ప్రకటించగానే యిది రాష్ట్ర మంతటను వర్తింప జేసారనే భయాందోళనలతో యీ భూస్వాములు రైతులను తొలగించారు. యింకను తొలగించడము జరుగుచున్నది. ఇట్లు జరుగుచుండగా రాష్ట్రములోని అనేకమంది రైతులు, కాలుదార్లు మహాసభలు జరిపి వారియొక్క కష్టములు సంగ్రహింపజేయుకొని దృష్టికి తీసుకొనిరావలసినప్పటికి, యీ చట్టాన్ని దురదృష్టవశాత్తు రాష్ట్రమంతటికి వర్తింపజేయకుండా ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేయడము అంతసవ్యమైన పనిగా కనబడుచులేదు. ఆయితే యీ చట్టము ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించి ప్యాసు చేసినప్పటికి, యీ చట్టాన్ని స్వరలోనే యీ రూపములో కాకపోయినా మరొక రూపములో మిగతా జిల్లాలలోని పరిస్థితులు దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని, ఈ వెళ్లగొట్టబడే కాలుదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకు అనుబంధ తీసుకొనివస్తే చాలామందిదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఆమువంటి చట్టము యీ కాలుదార్ల రక్షణకుగాను చాలా అవ్యవసరమని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఈ విషయము నేను యీ కాలుదార్ల పరిషత్ ప్రెసిడెంట్ వారితో చాలాచారిత్రానికి మనవి చేయుచున్నాను. అందుచేత యీ చట్టాన్ని యిప్పుడు ప్రస్తుతము వంటి పదలలోనైనా, కొన్ని సవరణలతో తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు యిప్పటికైనను ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్యాసుచేసినందుకు ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అభినందింపక తప్పదు. ఇదే మాదిరిగా ప్రభుత్వమువారు రాష్ట్రములోని అన్ని జిల్లాలకు వర్తింపజేసే చట్టాన్ని స్వరలో తెస్తారనే ఆశ, యీ కాలుదార్లలో వుండును. గనుక ప్రభుత్వము రాష్ట్రములో కష్టములకు పాల్పడినమువంటి యీ రైతులు, కాలుదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకై మరొక బిల్లును స్వరలో ప్యాసు చేస్తారని ఆశిస్తూ యింతటితో ముగిస్తున్నాను."

*SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—“கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த விவசாயிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டமானது மூன்றாவது முறையாக இந்த சபையிலே விவாதத்திற்கு வந்திருக்கும் இந்தச் சமயத்தில் நான் ஒரு சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தை விவசாயிகளின் பாதுகாப்புக்காக கொண்டுவரும் போது அதில் என்னென்ன இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதைப்பற்றியும் குறிப்பாக ஒரு வேலிக்குப்பட்ட மிளகாசாதிகள் பண்ணையாட்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கும் படியான கூலியில் சில குடும்பங்கள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. அதைப்பற்றி விளக்கவேண்டுமென்றும், ஒரு வேலி நிலம் பல கிராமங்களில் இருப்பவர்களுக்கும் இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக விலக்கு அளிக்கப்படுகிறதென்பதைப்பற்றியும் அப்பீல் இருக்கவேண்டும். அதாவது இப்பொழுது ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டு வைத்திருக்கும்படியான முறையானது சட்ட விவாதத்திற்குக் கட்டுப்படாமலிருப்பதால் அது சரியான முறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கக்கூடியது, அவர்கள் அதற்கு மேற்கொண்டு அப்பீல் செய்ய வேண்டுமானால், ஹைகோர்ட்டுக்குத்தான் போகவேண்டிய நிலை இருப்பதை மாற்றியமைக்கவேண்டுமென்றும் திருத்தப் பிரேரேபணை கொடுத்தும் சர்க்கார் அதை கவனிக்காது வருந்தத்தக்கது.”

“காம்பென்ஸேஷன் என்ற ஒரு முறையில் ரூ. 300 பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று’ இருந்தது. அதில் ஏற்கெனவே உள்ளபடி ரூ. 50 என்று இருந்தால் சௌகரியமாக இருக்குமென்று திருத்தம்

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] [3rd December 1952]

சொல்லப்பட்டது. இந்தப் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்ற முறையில் பார்க்கும்போது, அதே சமயத்தில் சிறிய மிராசதாரர்களைப் பாதிக்காத முறையில் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதை முக்கியமாக கவனத்தில் வைத்துக்கொண்டால் அது ஏற்கனவே இருந்ததைப்போல் இருந்தது நலமாக இருக்குமென்று திருத்தப் பிரேரணை கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது. ஆனால், அதை யெல்லாம் சர்க்கார் கவனத்தில் வைத்துக்கொள்ளவில்லை.

“குறிப்பாக, பார்க்கப்போனால் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் அதிக நிலம் படைத்தவர்கள் ஒரு சிலர்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். அதிலும் முக்கியமாக கவனித்தால் அங்கிருக்கும் பெரு நிலச் சுவாஸ்தாரர்கள் என்று சொல்லக் கூடியவர்கள் திருவாவடுதூரை, தருமபுரம், திருப்பனந்தான் போன்ற மடங்களுக்குச் சொந்தமான ஆயிரக்கணக்கான வேலி நிலங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அந்த நிலங்களை நேரடியாக குடியானவர்களுக்குச் சாகுபடிக்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லியும், அங்கு middlemen என்று சொல்லக் கூடியவர்கள் இன்னும் இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலைமையில்தான் இந்த சட்டம் இருக்கிறதே தவிர, இது நடைமுறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிப்பதாக இல்லை. இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலம் சர்க்காரே மறைமுகமாக middlemenக்கு ஆதரவு கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று சொல்லக்கூடிய நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறது.

“கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஒருவர் இப்பொழுது சர்க்காருடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவந்தார் அந்த நிலங்களைக் கூட்டுறவு சங்கங்கள் மூலமாக ஆங்காங்கே விவசாயப் பண்ணைகளின் மேற்பார்வைக்கு உட்பட்டு அந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கு பணம் வேண்டுமானாலும் சர்க்காரிலே கடன் கொடுக்கப்பட்டு விவசாயத்தை நடத்தி வந்தால் நல்ல முறையில் விவசாயம் நடக்கும் என்று. உணவு உற்பத்தியும் அதிக அபிவிருத்தி அடையுமென்பதை சர்க்காரின் கவனத்திற்கு கொண்டுவரப்படும் அதையும் சர்க்கார் கவனிக்கவில்லை. ஆகையால் இந்தத் திருத்தங்களுடன் இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்தால்தான் மக்களுக்கு பிரயோஜனப்படக்கூடிய முறையில் இருக்குமென்பதைப்பற்றி சொல்லு முகத்தான் நான் இதை எதிர்க்கிறேன்.

“இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் வரவேண்டுமென்று இருந்தவர்களில் நானும் ஒருவன். ஆனால் அதே சட்டம் எல்லோருக்கும் பாதகமான முறையில் இல்லாமல் சமுதாய முறையில் விவசாயம் நிரந்தரமாக நல்ல முறையில் நடக்க வேண்டுமென்று என்னும் கொண்டவர்களில் ஒருவரை நான் இருக்கிறபடியால், அந்த ஒரு சமூகமான நிலைமை ஏற்படுவதற்கான ஆதாரங்கள் இதில் இல்லையென்பதைக் கண்டு நான் மிகவும் வருந்துகிறேன்.

“ஆந்திர தேசத்தில் ஸைக்கோன் ஏற்பட்டதென்று கேள்விப்பட்டிருக்கிறோம். அதே மாதிரி சென்ற சில தினங்களில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு ஸைக்கோன் ஏற்பட்டது. அதைப்பற்றி கனம் அங்கத்தினர் சுயம் பிரகாசம் அவர்கள் சர்க்கார் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவந்தார்கள். அதனால் அங்குள்ள விவசாயிகள் தான் மிகவும் அதிகமாகப் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுடைய குச்சு வீடுகளெல்லாம் பிரிக்கப்பட்டுவிட்டன, ஹரி ஜனங்களானாலும் சரி, மற்ற குடியானவர்களானாலும் சரி, அவர்களுடைய இப்பொழுது வீட்டெல்லாம் தவிக்கிறார்கள். கால் நடைகள் அத்தையும் பாதிக்கப்பட்டு விட்டன. ஆனால், இந்தப் புயற் காற்றினால் விளைபொருள்களுக்கு அதிகமான சேதம் இல்லை, பயிர்ச்சேதம் இல்லை யென்று சொல்லலாம். சேதம் ஏற்பட்டதெல்லாம் கரும்பு, வாழை, தென்னை மாங்கள், ஆக இவைகளுக்குத்தான் அதிகமான சேதங்கள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன.

“கடைசியாக, இந்தச் சட்டத்தைப்பற்றி சொல்லும் போது இந்தத் திருத்தங்களில் முக்கியமானவற்றை அவர்கள் கொண்டுவராவிட்டால், இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவரும் அனால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு எந்தவிதமான பலனும் ஏற்படாது. நாங்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்கள், அதாவது எதிர்க்கட்சிக்காரர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்கள் என்ற முறையில் அதை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும், கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலேயே அந்தத் திருத்தங்களைக் கூடிய சீக்கிரம் கொண்டுவரவேண்டும்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri K. R. Sambandam]

இந்தச் சட்டத்தை நடைமுறையில் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரும்போது பல கஷ்டங்கள் ஏற்படலாம். அவைகளை நிவர்த்தி செய்வதற்கு சர்க்காரே இந்தத் திருத்தங்களைக் கொண்டுவருவார்களென்ற எண்ணத்தில்தான் நான் என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.”

* SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—“ அஷ்டம், ఈ Tanjore బిల్లుకు తంజా 4-30

పూరు రైతాంగము అనేక చోట్ల పోరాటాలు జరిగినతర్వాత, రైతులకు, కాలదార్లకు P.M.
కొన్ని స్వల్ప హక్కులను యిస్తున్నా బిల్లును తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ప్రత్యేక
సభ్యులు అందరుకూడ ఒక విషయాన్ని గురించి ఆసక్తిగా యీ బిల్లును రాష్ట్రానికి
అంతటకు అనువర్తింపజేయుచున్నారో అనుచున్నారు. కాని గవర్నమెంటు ప్రస్తుతము
అట్లా చేయటానికి అంగీకరించడములేదు. దీనికి ఒకే ఒక్క కారణము ఉన్నది.
అదేమిటనగా, దేశములో వ్యవసాయ సంబంధాలలో అలాంటి చట్టములు
తీసుకొనివచ్చి శాశ్వతముగా వ్యవసాయ సంబంధాలు పరిష్కరించుటకు ప్రభుత్వానికి
ఒక సమగ్రమైన దృక్పథము లేదు. దేశములో రైతులు కాలదార్లకు భూస్వాముల
నుండి కష్టాలు, దాడులు, భూములనుండి తొలగించడము, పోలీసు పర్యటన అనేవి
ఎప్పటికప్పుడు జరుగుతునే ఉన్నది. ఇంధకుగాను ప్రభుత్వమువారు రాజ్యాంగంగా
విశ్ కొన్ని చర్యలు తీసుకొంటున్నారేగాని దీనికి శాశ్వత పరిష్కారము జరుగుట
లేదు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంతవరకు Estates Land Act ఒకటి వ్యాసు చేసింది.
యీ చట్టము ఎన్నో సార్లు వ్యాసు చేసింది. 1908 లో ఒక చట్టము, 1936 లో
ఒక చట్టము, 1947 లో ఒక చట్టము, 1948 లో యింకొక చట్టము,
యీవిధముగా ఎన్నో వ్యాసు చేసింది. ఆయినను వీటియొక్క ఫలము నిష్ప
యోజనముగా కనబడుచున్నది. ఈ estates విషయములో ఇంతవరకు కూడ
తగాదాలు పరిష్కారము కాలేదు. ఈ చట్టము వచ్చిన తర్వాత దీనికి
సంబంధించిన తగాదా హోర్డులలో కొన్నియు, కుశ్రీం హోర్డులలో కొన్నియు
విచారణలో ఉన్నదేకాని వాటి అన్నిటిలో వివిధ జరుగుచున్నదో, యింత
వరకు హక్కు ఎవరిదో తేల్చడలేదు. యిటువంటి యాక్టు వ్యాసు చేసిన
ప్రయోజన మేమని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఒక ఉదాహరణ చెప్పుచున్నాను. మా
కాలాకాలా కరివేస అనే గ్రామములో యిటువంటి మూడువేల ఎకరాల భూమి
యీనాందార్లకు రైతులకు హక్కు విషయములో తగాదాలు ఎచ్చివరి. స్పెషల్
అఫీసరు దానిని ఎత్తేటన్నారు. ట్రిబ్యూనల్ ఎన్టేటు కాదన్నారు. కలెక్టరు
Rent Reduction Act apply చేసారు. వీటన్నింటిలో భూములపై రైతుల హక్కు
విమిటా ఎవరికి తెలియడంలేదు. ఈ భూమిపై యీనాందార్లకు హక్కులను
రైతుల హక్కు ఏమి అనే విషయము యింతవరకు తేల్చలేకుండా యున్నాయి. ప్రతి
సంవత్సరము ఈ భూమియొక్క విషయములో పోరాటము జరుగుచునేయున్నది.
ఇటువంటి చట్టము రాష్ట్రమువంతటికి అనువర్తింపజేసేసట్లయితే యీలాంటి తగా
దాలు ఉండేవికావు. ఇప్పుడు యీ తంజావూరు బిల్లు యీ రాష్ట్రమువంతటకు
వర్తింపజేయుటకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఎందుకు నిరాకరిస్తున్నారో తెలియడంలేదు
శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు రాష్ట్రములో భువన రైతులకు అందరి రక్షణకొరకు పిల
అనువర్తింప చేయలేకపోతున్నారో బోధపడడం లేదు. తంజావూరులో భువన
పోరాటాలు, తంజావూరులో జరిగే కల్లలాలు రాష్ట్రమంతటను ఉన్నవని గురించి
రాష్ట్రమంతట ఈ బిల్లు వర్తింపజేసేసట్లయితే గ్రామాలలో ఈ విధమైన కల్ల
లాలు జరుగవు. మరొక్క ఉదాహరణం ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టిలోనికి తీసుకొని
వస్తున్నాను. లింగాల అనే గ్రామములో రెండువందల యెకరాలు అక్కడ
భువన పరిజనులు ఇరవై సంవత్సరాలుగా సాగుచేస్తున్నారు. Tanjore Ordinance

[Sri C. Pulla Reddi] [3rd December 1952]

సమీప తర్వాత యిక్కడ జరిగిన విషయమును యేమిటంటే యీ ఘామి విషయములో తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ఉన్న ఘాసమస్యయే వచ్చింది, ఆ ఘాసాములు ఆ ఘాముల నుండి వెళ్లి సామ్యని ఆర్డరు జారీ చేశారు. ఈ హరిజనులు నిరాశ నిస్సహాయులై యున్నారు. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని రైతులకు, కౌలుదార్లు, పన్నయాలకు మాత్రము రక్షణ లభిస్తుంది. శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు యిక్కడగూడ యీ చట్టము వర్తింపజేసే వాగుండును అని అంటున్నారు. ఈ గ్రామములో క్రైతుమీద 144 సెక్షను ఆర్డరు జారీ చేసి వీరిని వెళ్లగొట్టడానికి ప్రభుత్వమే యీ చర్య జరుపుచున్నది. ప్రతి పక్ష సభ్యులు అందరు యీ హరిజనులకు యీ చిల్లు రాష్ట్రము అంతటకు అడులు జరిగేటట్లు చేస్తామని ఎన్నో వాగ్దానాలు హరిజనులకు చేసేయున్నారు. ఆ వాగ్దానాలు అన్నియు యిప్పుడు నిద్రయోజనము లెత్తుతున్నవి. యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము ఇది ఒక నిద్రయోజనమైన చిల్లును తెచ్చిందని హెచ్చరిక చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ చిల్లు రాష్ట్రమంతటకు వ్యాప్తితము చేయక పోవడము బహుశా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ప్రదేశము వేరుగా కనబడుచున్నది. బహుశా రాష్ట్రములోని ఘాసాములందరికీ తగిన సాంకాశము, వారియొక్క ఘాసాములను త్వరలో స్వాధీనపరచుకొనుటకును, వారికి శ్రుతులువంటి ఘాములకు సంబంధించిన రికార్డు అంతయు జాగ్రత్త పరచుకోగలందులకు తగిన సాంకాశము కలుగజేయటానికిన్ని, తంజావూరు చిల్లు రాష్ట్రమంతటకీని వర్తింపజేసే లోపల ఘాసాములు తగు జాగ్రత్త తీసుకొని, మేల్కొన గలందులకునూ, వారు ప్రస్తుతములో రాష్ట్రమంతటకీని వ్యాపింపజేయుటకులేదని బోధపడుచున్నది. బహుశా యీ ఘాసాములు వారియొక్క పరిస్థితులు చక్కబరచుకొన్న తర్వాత, యీ చిల్లును notification ద్వారా రాష్ట్రమున కంతటకు విస్తరింపజేస్తారని హెచ్చరిక చేస్తున్నాను. నిజముగా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ఉద్దేశ్యము యిదే అయినట్లయితే, వారు అట్లా జరిగేలోపున రాష్ట్రములో చాలా తీవ్రమైన పరిణామాలు ఏర్పడును అనే సమ్యక్తముతో చెప్పుచున్నాను. రాష్ట్రము వ్యవసాయ సంబంధాలు కలిగిన ప్రదేశము అని వారికి పూరిగా తెలుసును. చాలాకాలముగా జీవనమువల్ల కష్టించేటటువంటి యీ రైతులకు, కౌలుదార్లకు వెంటనే తగిన రక్షణకు ఒక సమగ్రమైన చట్టాన్ని తీసుకొనివస్తేనేగాని యీ ఘాసమస్య పరిష్కారము కానేరదు. అందుకని నేను ముఖ్యముగా వారిని నోరేది యేమిటంటే యీ కౌలు దార్ల రక్షణకు రాష్ట్రమంతటికీ వర్తింపజేయుచట్టు మరొకదాన్ని తీసుకొని వచ్చి వ్యవ సాయమునకు సంబంధించిన అర్థిక సమస్య పరిష్కారమునకు తోడ్పడుటకు ప్రభుత్వము వారు వెంటనే మరొక చిల్లును తెస్తారని అనుకున్నాను.”

3rd December 1952]

[Sri R. Krishnan]

പ്രമുഖ രചനകൾ സ്വീകാരകൾ ഉള്ള എങ്കും ഞതു കഴിഞ്ഞാൽ ഉണ്ടോ ഇല്ലയോ എന്ന് തനിക്ക് സംശയം ജനിക്കുന്ന ഭൂമിയിൽ തന്റെ കാൽപ്പായി പ്രയത്നിക്കുവാൻ തുടങ്ങി. മിന്നുകൂട്ടലോ എന്ന കാര്യം സംശയമാണ്. സാധാരണ മലബാറിൽ കാണുന്ന വെറുപ്പുള്ള കുടിയന്മാരുടെ സ്ഥിതി ഇതാണ്. എ വെച്ചാൽ തനിക്ക് സ്വീകാരകൾ ഉള്ള സ്വന്തം ഭൂമിയിൽ കാൽപ്പായി വളം വേർതി പണിയിക്കുക അത്രയും സ്വീകാരകൾ ഇല്ലാത്ത ഭൂമിയിൽ വളം വേർതി പണിയിക്കുക. ഇതു തുടങ്ങിയതാണ്. ഇവ നിലകൾ നായു കൊല്ലം കഴിഞ്ഞതിനുശേഷം ഭൂമിയിൽ തനിക്ക് യാതൊരു അവകാശവും ഇല്ലെന്ന് തുടിക്കുകയും വേണ്ടത്ര വരികയാണെങ്കിൽ നീക്കിയായും ഇന്ന് ഇവ മേന്മയിനെ നേരിട്ടുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന കേരള കാർഷികരെ ഒരു പരിഹാസം കാണാത്തതു പോലാണെന്നും തുടിക്കുക കിട്ടുമോ എന്ന കാര്യം സംശയമാണ്. ഇപ്പോൾത്തന്നെ മിറാസാദാരു അതുപോലെ ഭൂമി ഉടമസ്ഥനായും ഇവ ബില്ലുകൾക്കു വരു നന്നയും തുടിക്കുക കിട്ടുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതുകൂടി തട്ടിയിട്ടു കൊണ്ട് കരുതിക്കൂട്ടി പല ശ്രമങ്ങളും ചെയ്തിട്ടുണ്ടാകും. കോടതികളിൽ പലരും കേസുകൾ കൊടുത്തുണ്ടാകും. അതിനെ കോടതിയുടെ വിധി സാവ സാനിക്കുമ്പോഴേക്കുതന്നെ രണ്ടു മൂന്ന് കൊല്ലം കഴിയുകയും, അതിനുശേഷം കിട്ടുന്ന വരികൾ മാത്രം മാത്രമേ തുടിക്കുക ഭൂമി കൊടുക്കു പിടുകയുള്ളൂ എന്ന വരികൾ ഞതു കഴിയുമ്പോഴേക്ക് നിയമത്തിന്റെ കലാപവിധിയും കഴിയുകയാണെങ്കിൽ അതു വലിയ കഷ്ടമാണ്. ഇവ ബില്ലു വമ്പിച്ച ഗുണമൊന്നും തുടിക്കുക, നായാർ ഉദ്യോഗി എന്ന ഗുണമൊന്നും വരുത്തുന്നില്ല എന്നതു ഇരിക്കട്ടെ. എങ്കിലും സംസ്ഥാനമൊട്ടു തുടിക്കുക ഒരു കിട്ടിയിട്ടു കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുന്ന ഭൂമികൾക്കു ഇതു ഒരു നേരിയ അടിയായി വന്നുവെങ്കിലും ഇവ ബില്ലുതന്നെ സംസ്ഥാനമൊട്ടു ബാധകമാകുവാൻ വേണ്ടി എന്തു പക്ഷംഗങ്ങൾ കൊണ്ടുവന്നിട്ടുള്ള വിചാരിച്ച നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങൾക്കു വേണ്ടിയുള്ള തള്ളിക്കളഞ്ഞിരിക്കുകയാണ്. നായാർക്കും മദ്രാസ് ഗവണ്മെന്റിൽ മറ്റു ഭാഗങ്ങളിലും തുടിക്കാൻ കിട്ടിയിട്ടുള്ളതൊന്നും വീണ്ടെടുക്കു വന്നും കിട്ടിയിട്ടു കൊണ്ടിരിക്കുകയാണ്. അവയെല്ലാവരും പുരോഗമനപരമായ ബില്ലുകൾ തയ്യാറാക്കു കിട്ടണം എന്ന അവരുടെ ആവശ്യത്തെ പ്രതിനിധീകരിക്കുകയാണെന്നും ഇവ ബില്ലു സംസ്ഥാനമൊട്ടു ബാധകമാകണമെന്ന ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടത്. അതിനനുസരിച്ചു തുടിക്കുക ആവശ്യമായ നിർദ്ദേശങ്ങൾക്കു വേണ്ടിയുള്ള തള്ളിക്കളഞ്ഞിരിക്കുകയാണ്. മലബാർ കടിയെ നിയമ കേസരിബിൽ അടുത്ത വരവാൻ പോകുന്നു എന്നുള്ളതു സന്തോഷാധരമാണ്. ആ ബില്ലു കൊടുത്തതന്നെ അവസരത്തിൽ എന്തുപക്ഷംഗങ്ങളുടെ അഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ കാൽപ്പായി വെച്ചുള്ള പരിഗണിക്കുകയും ഇവ ബില്ലിനു കാണിച്ചുവന്നിരുന്ന ഒരു നിലപാടു സ്വീകരിച്ചുകൊണ്ടുള്ള ഒരു സ്ഥിതി ആയിരിക്കുകയും എന്ന ആശിഷ്ടകൊണ്ടു തന്നെ തല്പരം വരികുന്നു."

* **SRI P. CHOKKALINGAM** :—“கனம் உப சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, 4-40
சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கிற p.m.
இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் எந்த அளவுக்கு இந்த மாகாணம் முழுவதிலும்
இருக்கக்கூடிய சாதாரண விவசாயிகள், குறிப்பாக அதிகப் பகுதியாக
விவசாயத்தில் ஈடுபட்டிருக்கின்ற ஹரிஜனங்கள், என்ன எதிர்பார்த்தார்
கனோ அந்தப் பலன் பரிபூரணமாக இதன்மூலம் கிடைக்கவில்லை; அல்லது
அவர்களைத் திருப்திபடுத்தக்கூடிய வகையிலும் இல்லை. இருந்தாலுங்கூட
இப்போது சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கும் இந்தச் சட்டம்
மூன்று அம்சங்களைக் கொண்டிருப்பதனாலே குறைந்தபட்சம் அவர்
களுக்கு நன்மை செய்யக்கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது என்ற முறையில் அதை
நான் வரவேற்கிறேன்.

“குறிப்பாக, நம்முடைய மாகாணம் முழுதிலும் இந்தத் தேர்தல் காலத்தில் என்ன எதிர்ப்பார்த்தார்கள் என்பதை சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் கொஞ்சம் யோசித்துப் பார்த்தால் நல்லது. சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலுள்ளவர்களும், பல காங்கிரஸ் கட்சி அபேட்சர்களும் தேர்தல் காலத்தில் சப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் தீர்ப்பை சட்டபூர்வமாக இந்த மாகாணம் முழுதிலும் அதிசீக்கிரம் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்படுமென்று பல இடங்களில் பேசினார்கள் என்பதை நான் அறிவேன். சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலுள்ளவர்களும் அறிவார்கள்.

[Sri P. Chokkalingam] [3rd December 1952]

“அது மட்டுமல்ல. சென்ற பட்ஜெட் கூட்டத்திலும் கூட சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் உள்ளவர்கள் சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் தீர்ப்பின் பிரகாரம் ஒரு சட்டம் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்படவேண்டுமென்று பல மெம்பர்கள் பேசினார்கள், என்பதையும் சர்க்காருக்கு ஞாபகமூட்ட விரும்புகிறேன்.

“முக்கியமாக இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய பெரும்பான்மையான விவசாயிகளின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமானாலும், அல்லது உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கவேண்டுமென்றாலும், விவசாயத்திலே ஊக்கமும் நம்பிக்கையும் ஏற்படவேண்டுமென்றாலும், என்னைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் இன்றைக்கு சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டி என்ன தீர்ப்பு அளித்திருக்கிறதோ அதில் ஒரு அம்சத்தை, அதாவது ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு பயிர் செய்ய அவர்களுக்கு உத்தரவாதம் அளிக்கக்கூடியதை நிரந்தரமாக்கி, மற்ற அம்சங்களையும் சட்டபூர்வமாகக் கொண்டுவந்தால் என்னைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் பரிபூரணமாக அதை நான் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேன். நம்முடைய மாகாணத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய ஜனங்கள் தற்கால ரீதியில் அதை பரிபூரணமாக வரவேற்பார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு ஓரளவு திருப்தியும் வாழ்க்கை சௌகரியமும் ஏற்படுமென்று சர்க்காருக்கு நான் உணர்த்திக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

“ஆனால், இன்னொரு விஷயத்தையும் நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதென்பதில் சர்க்கார் கவனம் செலுத்தவேண்டுமென்றாலும், அல்லது சாதாரணமாக விவசாயிகளின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்றாலும், இன்றிருக்கக்கூடிய நிலையில் இந்தச் சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் ஓரளவுதான் செளகரியம் செய்திருக்கிறது. இது போதாது. ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு ஓரளவு விவசாயிகள் அந்த நிலத்திலிருந்து அப்புறப்படுத்தப்படமாட்டார்கள் என்று இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் இருந்தாலுங்கூட மிராசதார்கள் அந்த விவசாயிகளை அப்புறப்படுத்துவதற்குப் பலவிதமான சாக்குப் போக்குகளைச் சிருஷ்டிக்க முடியும். அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் அதிகாரங்களும் சௌகரியங்களும் இருக்கின்றன என்பதைப் பல திருத்தங்கள் மூலம் சர்க்காருக்கு அறிவிக்கப்படும் அதை சர்க்கார் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாதது வருந்தத்தக்கது. குறிப்பாக, தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்குக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கும் இந்த சட்டமானது மற்ற எல்லா பகுதிகளிலும் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட திருத்தத்தை சர்க்கார் ஏன் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவில்லை என்பதை என்னால் புரிந்துகொள்ள முடியவில்லை.

(At this stage Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் குடியானவர்களுக்கு ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு உத்தரவாதம் இருக்கின்றது. இன்னும் அடுத்தபடியாக 40% குடியானவர்களுக்குக் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய ஒரு சிறிய சலுகை இருக்கிறது. திருநெல்வேலி பகுதியிலே, குறிப்பாக என்னுடைய தொகுதியிலே, நீண்டகாலமாக விவசாயிகளின் மத்தியில் ஊழியம் செய்துவந்திருக்கிறேன். அந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் பல கிராமங்களில் விவசாயிகள் யுத்த காலத்தில் ஏற்பட்ட விலைவாசிகள் உயர்வின்காரணமாகவும் வேறு பல காரணங்களினாலும் அவர்களுக்கு இருக்கின்ற வருமானமானது போதவில்லை என்ற காரணத்தால் ஒரு பெரிய விவசாய எழுச்சி தாலாகா முழுவதும் ஏற்பட்டதென்பதை சர்க்கார் அறிந்திருக்கலாம். அதே சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் நான் குறிப்பாக சில பகுதிகளில், சுமார் 3, 4 கிராமங்களில் ஆங்காங்கு மிராசதார்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் மத்தியஸ்தம் செய்து, ஒரு 40% விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கிடைக்கும்படியாக ஒரு சமாதான ஒப்பந்தமாக ஏற்பாடு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். ஆனால், ஒரு ஆண்டு வரையில்தான் அது நிலத்திருந்தது. அடுத்த ஆண்டில் மிராசதார்கள் பலவிதத்தில் அவர்களுக்கிடையே ஒரு பிளவை உண்டுபண்ணிக் கொண்டு, கொடுத்த அந்த சலுகையைப் பறித்துக்கொண்டார்கள். ஆகவே, இதையெல்லாம் பார்க்கும்போது, சட்டபூர்வமாக 40% உத்தரவாதம் அளித்திருப்பதை நம்முடைய மாகாணம் முழுதிலும் உள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கிடைக்கும்படிச் செய்தால் விவசாயிகள் வரவேற்கக்கூடியதாக இருக்கும் என்று சர்க்காரின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Chokkalingam]

“ முக்கியமாக, இன்றைக்கு இது ஓரளக்கு வரவேற்கப்படுகிறதென்றும், சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் ஏற்கனவே கொடுத்த வாக்குறுதிப்பட்டியும், இன்னும் தேர்தல் காலத்தில் பல காங்கிரஸ் அபேட்சகர்கள் கொடுத்த வாக்குறுதிப்பட்டியும், இன்றைக்கு இருக்கின்ற சாதாரண உழவர்களுக்கு நியாயம் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய வகையிலும், அடுத்தபடியாக உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதற்கான ஊக்கத்தையும் நம்பிக்கையையும் அளிக்கும் வகையிலும், இன்றைக்கு இதை இன்னும் மாகாணம் முழுவதிலும் விஸ்தரிப்பதோடல்லாமல், சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் தீர்மானச் சட்டபூர்வமாக அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று சர்க்காரைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். ஆகவே, இந்த மசோதாவை நான் வரவேற்று என்னுடைய பேச்சை இத்திடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். ”

*SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ తంజావూరు బిల్లులో ప్రధానమైన లోపాలు కనపడవుంటే దీన్ని సేను బలపరచుచున్నాను. అయితే గౌరవ నీయమైన ఆనేక మంది సభ్యులు తమ తమ అభిప్రాయాలు చెప్పారు. అందుకు సభ్యులు చెప్పినదానిలో ఒకటికే ముఖ్య విషయమున్నది. ఈ బిల్లు తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే పరిమితము చేసి ఉండి, రాష్ట్రమంతటకును దీన్ని ప్రవేశపెట్టక పోవడమనేదే ప్రధానమైన టిక్కెట్ గౌరవ. దీనిని గురించి ఇంకా సేను స్పష్టముగా చెప్పవలసిన పని లేదు. ఈ రోజున ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారికి సేను చేసే విజ్ఞప్తి విమిటంబే ముఖ్యంగా ఉన్నాడు యీ agrarian భాసమస్యనుగురించిన సంద్భావన రాష్ట్రమంతటకును వ్యాపించి ఆనేక చోట్ల ఆనేకమైన దుస్సంఘటనలకు దారితీయుచున్నది. ఇది రాష్ట్రములో ప్రధానమైన సమస్యగా పరిగణించినది. ఇప్పటికే యీ భాసమస్యవల్ల ఏ ప్రాంతములో చూచినప్పటికీ రైతులు కౌలుదార్లు ఆనేకమైన విరుగుటలుగా ఏర్పడి తమిళనాడునుండి తెలుగు జిల్లాలకు, కాయంసీరు జిల్లాలనుండి సర్కారు జిల్లాలకు, సర్కారు జిల్లాలనుండి మరొక చోటికి, యీ విధముగా ఒక ప్రాంతమునుండి మరొక ప్రాంతానికి ఇల్లువాకిట్లు విడిచిపెట్టి జీవనబృతికొరకు వలసపోతున్నారు. ఈ విషయము ప్రభుత్వమువారికి గోచరమగుచు నేయున్నది. ఈ బిల్లుఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రము యీ భాసమస్యపరిష్కారమునకు వర్తింపజేయుచు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఆలోచనకృష్టి పడడమనేది సమంజసముకాదు. ఈ సమస్య చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటిది. ఇది రాష్ట్రమంతటను వ్యాపించింది. అందుకనే రాష్ట్రములోవున్న అన్ని జిల్లాలలో ఉన్న తీవ్ర హస్తీతులనుబట్టి యీ ప్రతిరక్షనభ్యులు యీ బిల్లు విషయములో ఆనేక మంది ఆనేక సూచనలుచేసి రాష్ట్రములోని పరిస్థితుల కనుగుణంగా సవరణలను తెచ్చిఉన్నారు. ఈ సవరణలు యిచ్చినవాడు అందుకూడా ఈ బిల్లు రాష్ట్రవ్యాపితముచేస్తాననే దృష్టితోనే సవరణలు ప్రతిపాదించారు. ఇప్పుడు ఈ బిల్లుకు రెండవ రీడింగు అయిపోయిన తర్వాత దీనిని ఆమోదించకముందు, ఇంకొకటిన్న కొన్ని ముఖ్యమైన లోపాలు పరిశీలించవలసియున్నది. గానెనెట్టి సమావేశంలో మంత్రిగారు చేసిన వాగ్దానం మరిచి పోగూడదు. వీరు చేసిన వాగ్దానలయొక్క ప్రధాన అత్యంతము రాష్ట్రమంతటికీ వర్తింపజేయకుండా ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే ఇప్పుడు వర్తింపజేయుము అని సంకల్పింపడటమనేది సమంజసముకాదు. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ బిల్లు రాష్ట్రములోని కౌలుదార్లకు శాశ్వత జిరాయిటీపాకుల రక్షణ లభ్యముచేయవలసినటువంటిదై యున్నది. ఇదే చాలా మంది కోరుతుంటే విషయము. దురదృష్టవశాత్తు చాశ్వత రక్షణ అనేది ఇక్కడ తీరస్కరించడము జరిగింది. ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైన విషయము. రాష్ట్రములో కౌలుదార్లు యీ భాసామునుండి ఎన్ని ఇబ్బందులకు గురిఅగుచున్నారో ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించినట్లు లేదు పోనీ, శాశ్వత రక్షణ ఇవ్వకపోయినను, ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులుచేసిన పది సంవత్సరముల రక్షణకుగాను సవరణ ఆమోదించమని కోరి

“கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியும், சர்க்காரில் இருக்கின்ற தமிழ் பத்திரிகைகளுக்கெல்லாம் தெரியும். சபையிலுள்ள தமிழங்கத்தினர் களுக்கு எல்லாம் தெரியும்; ‘மந்திரிக்கழகு வரும் பொருள் உரைத்தல்’, என்ற உண்மை.

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Jeevanandam]

“நாளைக்கு நாட்டில் என்ன நடக்கும் என்பதை இன்றைக்கே உணர்ந்து உணர்த்தற்கு ஏற்ற வகையில் நடப்பது அவசியம். இந்த மாதிரி எந்த மந்திரியாவது நடந்திருக்கிறார்களா? 1952-ம் (வரு) தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலே யுள்ள மிராசதார், விவசாயிகள் நிலைமை ரொம்பவும் சீர்கெட்டுப்போய்விட்ட தின் காரணமாக உணவு உற்பத்தி பாதிக்கப்படாமலிருக்க வேண்டுமென்ப தற்காக இந்தச் சட்டத்தை கொண்டுவரப்படுகின்றது என்று இந்த மசோதா வின் பாயிரம் கூறுகிறது. மிராசதார், விவசாயிகள் உறவு நிலை சீர்கெட்டு வருகிறது என்பதை 1946-ம் (வரு)த்திலேயே உணர்ந்திருக்க வேண்டாமா? எப்பொழுது 1946-ம் வருத்திலே மிராசதார்கள், விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்ற ஆரம்பித்தார்களோ நிசச் சீர்திருத்தக் கமிட்டியின் அறிக்கை சமர்ப்பிக்கப் பட்டவுடன் ஏற்றப்பட்ட கொடூர நிலவெளியேற்றத்தைக் கண்டபொழு தாவது மிராசதார்கள், விவசாயிகள் உறவு நிலைமை சீர்கெட்டு வருகிறது. ரொம்பவும் சீர்குலைந்து போய்விடும் என்று எதிர்பார்த்தார்களா? அதிலும் காங்கிரஸின் தூண்கள்போன்ற வாண்டையார், வடபாதி மங்கலம், குன்னியூர் ஐயர் இவர்களெல்லாம் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களை அப்பொழுதே அம் மாதிரி செய்யப்படாமல் தடுத்திருந்தால் இன்றைய தினம் இந்த விவசாயப் பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்பு மசோதா கொண்டுவர நேர்ந்திருக்குமாவென்று கேட்கிறேன்? அப்படி அப்பொழுது செய்யவில்லை. அந்தத் தவறால் இன்றைய தினம் ஏற்பட்டுப்போன ஒரு நிலைமையைச் சமாளிக்கக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டதுதான் இந்தச் சட்டம்; இது தப்பைத் திருத்திக்கொள்ளும் ஒரு செயலே தவிர இனிமேல் என்ன வரப்போகின்றது என்பதை உணர்ந்து எடுக் கப்பட்ட நடவடிக்கையில்: அதை ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். இன்றைய தினம் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டுமென நாங்கள் திருத்தம் கொடுக்கும்போது அது எப்படி தகராறை வளர்க்கும் என்று கனம் வெங்கட்டராமையர் சொல்வாரா?

“ஒளவையார் சொன்னார்கள்: ‘சோழவள நாடு சோறுடைத்து’ என் பதாக. தஞ்சை ஜில்லா நமது மாகாணத்தின் நெற்களஞ்சியமென தான் பையனாக இருந்தபோதே படித்திருக்கிறேன். அதாவது தஞ்சை ஜில்லா, தன்வையடி தேவையோக இரண்டரை லக்ஷம் டன் அரிசையை உபரியாக பிற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கு அனுப்பி வைத்திருக்கிறது. இன்றைய தினம் அந்த ஜில்லாவின் உற்பத்தி பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதற்குக் காரணம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள மிராசதார், விவசாயிகளின் உறவு நிலை பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருப் பதுதான். ஆகவே, அதைச் சீமாளிக்கவேண்டும். அதற்கு ஒரு சட்டம் வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத்தான் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இதைக்கொண்டு வந்திருக் கிறார்கள். ஆகவே, இந்த மசோதாவின் பிரிவுகளையும், திருத்தங்களையும் விவசாயப் பண்ணையாள் நலனை முக்கியப்படுத்தித்தான் ஆராய்ந்து பார்க்க வேண்டும். சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து எதிர்க்கட்சியார் பிரேரித்த திருத்தங் கள் எல்லாம் நல்லுறவைப்பாதித்து குழப்பத்தை அதிகப்படுத்துமென அபிப்பிராயமுள்ளவர்கள் எல்லாம் கவனிக்கவேண்டும்.

“இது பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம், விவசாயிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம். மிராசதார்கள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டமல்ல. ஆகையால் சர்க்கார் தரபா ராலேயே குழப்பத்தை அடக்க சட்டம் கொண்டுவராமல் முடியவில்லை. சட்டம் வேண்டும் என்றும் பொழுதுதோல்வியை ஒப்புக்கொண்டுவிட்டார்கள் என்றே யாகிறது. அதோடு சர்க்கார் தரப்பு வெங்ஷட்டராமையர் பேசும்பொழுது முன்பு ‘தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் 20% தான் வாரம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. இப்பொழுது சட்டத்தால் 40% வாரம் கொடுக்கப்படும். 20% வாங்கிய இடத்திற்கு சர்க்கார் 40% தரவேண்டுமென சட்டம் போடும்பொழுது எதிர்தரப்பார் 60% தர வேண்டுமென சொல்வது அமைதியைக் காக்கலா’ என்று கேட்டார்; ‘60% தரவேண்டுமென்பது நியாயமா?’ என்று கேட்கிறவர் இது வரையில் 20% கொடுத்து வந்தோம் என்று தங்களுடைய சரண்டல் கொள்கையை ஒப்புக் கொண்டுவிட்டார். நாங்கள் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 60% கொடுக்கவேண்டும். சப்பிர மணியம் கமிட்டியாரின் சிபார்சுப்படி 55% கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லு கிறோம். இப்படிச் சொல்வது தகராறை உண்டுபண்ணுமென்று சொல்லு கிறார். நிசச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்யப்போகிறோம், என்று பறைசாற்றிக்

[Sri P. Jeevanandam] [3rd December 1952]

கொண்டது காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியில்லையா? சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியை அமைத்திருக்கிறோம். அதன் சிபார்சை செய்யப்போகிறோமென்று தேர்தல் காலத்தில் பிரசாரம் செய்யவில்லையா? அதேசிபார்சுகள் எங்கள் பக்கத்திலிருந்து சொன்னாலும் அமைதியை சூலைக்கவேண்டு கருதுவது?

“கடைசியாகச் சொல்லுகிறேன். ஒரே ஒரு வார்த்தை. மசோதாவிற்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்ட பல திருத்தங்கள் நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டுவிட்டன. விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்குப் போதுமான அளவு பாதுகாப்பு இல்லை. பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு மனைக்கட்டு உரிமையில்லை. அதோடு இதை எல்லா இடத்திற்கும் விஸ்தரிக்கவேண்டுமென்று திருத்தம் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளப்படவில்லை. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவைப்போல குண்டூரிலும், கிருஷ்ணாவிலும் இதேபோல மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களிலும் உறவு நிலை பாதிக்கப்படாமலிருக்கும்பொழுதே இச்சட்டத்தை விஸ்தரிக்காவிட்டால் தஞ்சையைவிட மிக மோசமாக அவைகளிலும் நிலைமை மாறிவிடுமென்று சொல்ல விரும்புகின்றேன். சட்டத்தை விஸ்தரிக்காவிட்டால் கிராச்சி நடக்கும்.

* SRI G. NARAYANASWAMI NAIDU :—“கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே! இந்தச் சட்டம் கடைசி முறையாக விவாதிக்கப்படுகின்ற நிலைமையைக் கண்டு நான் மட்டற்ற மதிர்ச்சியை அடைகிறேன். சென்ற ஐந்தாறு வருஷகாலமாக இந்தமாதிரியானதோர் சட்டத்தை இயற்றவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தில் மந்திரிசபை இருக்கும் இந்தத் திசை நோக்கியே மக்களை ஊக்கிவந்தவன் நான் என்ற முறையிலும் சந்தோஷம் அடைகிறேன். பிரசித்திபெற்ற மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தத்தை நமது அரசாங்கம் ஒப்புக்கொண்டு அதைச் சட்டத்தில் ஒத்துக்கொண்டு அதன்படி சில ஷரத்துக்களை ஏற்றுக்கொண்டதற்கும் அந்த ஒப்பந்தத்தின் ஆதி கர்தா என்ற முறையில் நான் பெருமையும், சந்தோஷமும் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்தச் சட்டம் விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களிடையே ஏற்பட்டு வளர்ந்து கொண்டிருந்த அதிகருபதியை மற்றிவிட்டது என்ற காரணத்திற்காக மாதிரம் இதை நான் வரவேற்கவில்லை. இந்தத் துறையிலே இது தான் முதன்முயற்சி. ரயில்வேயில் வேலை செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறவர்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். Facing point என்று சொல்லுவதுண்டு. பலமான அகலமான தண்டவாளங்களிடையே ஒடிக்கொண்டிருக்கும் ரயில்வண்டித்தொடரை, அடுத்த லயனில் மாற்றிவிட்டு இரண்டு தண்டவாளங்களிடையே ஒரு கூர்மையான அகலமற்ற தண்டவாளத்தை வைத்து அடுத்த வினாடியில் திருப்பி விட்டுவிடுவார்கள். அந்த அபாரமானதொரு காரியத்தைப் போலவே தான் இன்றையதினம் நமது மந்திரி சபையில் தலைவர் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் ஒரு புதிய திருப்பத்திலே, தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளையும், மிராசதார்களையும், இன்றையதினம் இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாகச் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். இன்றையதினம் வரையிலும் சட்டத்தாலும், சமூகத்தாலும் அதிகமாகப் புறக்கணிக்கப்பட்டு வந்த விவசாயப்பெரு மக்களுக்குச் சட்டத்தால் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்க வந்தது இந்த சர்க்காரின் மிகத் துணிகரமானதோர், அபார செய்கையாகும். மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தம் தான் அந்தத் துறையிலும் முதன் முயற்சி. மிகவும் பிரசித்திபெற்ற அந்த மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தத்தின் வெற்றியேதான் இன்றையதினம் இந்தச் சட்டசபையில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளின், பண்ணையாட்களின் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவருவதற்கு அடிப்படையாக இருந்தது. அந்த முறையிலும் நான் மிகவும் சந்தோஷப்படுகிறேன். இனிமேல் நம் எல்லோருடைய குறிக்கோள்களும் ஒன்றாகவேயிருக்கவேண்டும். எந்த இடத்திலும் மிராசதார்கள், விவசாயிகளிடையே பூசல்கள் உண்டாக்கி விவசாய உற்பத்தி பாதிக்கப்படாமல் பாத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். தகராறு ஏதேனும் ஏற்பட்டால் அதை வளரவிடாமல் தடுப்பதற்கு இந்தச் சட்டம் இருக்கிறது. இது ரொம்பவும் பொருத்தமானதோர் சட்டமாகும். ஆகவே உணவு உற்பத்தியை பாதிக்கக்கூடிய அளவுக்கு இனி எந்தத் தகராறும் இளம்பாது. நாமும் கிளப்பிவிடாமல் இருக்கவேண்டியதும் மிகவும் அவசியம். அப்படி அமைதியான முறையிலே, புதிய தான முறையிலே, புதிய உற்சாகத்தோடு விவசாயிகள் பாடுபட்டு உழைத்தார்களேயானால் நம் நாட்டின் உணவு உற்பத்தி மிகவும் பெருகும்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu]

இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் 'மூட நெய் பெய்து முழங்கை வழி வார, கூடியிருந்து' உழவர், உழமையாளர் எல்லோரும் ஆனந்தமாக உண்ணக் கூடிய ஒரு சபிச நிலைமை நிச்சயம் உண்டாக்கப்படும். அதில் ஐயம் வேண்டியதில்லை. இவ்வளவு நாளாக மிராசதார்கள், விவசாயிகள் இவர்களிடையே ஏற்பட்ட பூசல் மேலும் மேலும் வளர்ந்து கொண்டிருக்கும் என்று யாரும் கவலைப்படவேண்டியதில்லை.

‘போய் பிழையும், புகுந்ருவான் நின்றனவும் ; தீயினில் தாசாகும்,’ 5 p.m.

என்பதைப்போல சென்ற கால பிழைகளும் இனி ஏற்படும் பிழைகளும் அவைகள் யாவும் இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் நிச்சயமாக மறைந்து அழிந்து போகும். ஆதலினால் புதிய பூசல்களை, பிரச்சனைகளை கிளப்பி விடாமல், வெகு ஜாக்கனதையாக இந்த உழவர் உரிமையாளர் இருசாராரும் நம் நாட்டு விவசாய உணவு உற்பத்தியில் அமைதியாக ஈடுபட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கும் படியாக நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டியது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும். அப்பொழுதுதான் நிச்சயமாக நல்ல பலன் கிடைக்கும். ஆனால் சுமீபகாலத்தில் குடந்தையில் கூடிய மிராசதாரர்கள் எல்லோரும் ஒரு அறிக்கை விடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் காலம்தான் அவர்களுக்கு அவர்களுடைய செய்கை சரியானதா, தப்பானதா என்பதை உணர்ந்து கொள்ளும்படி செய்யவேண்டும். நிச்சயமாக அந்தக் காலம் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு தெவியையும், புதிய அறிவையும் கொடுக்குமென்றே நான் நம்புகிறேன். அவர்கள் ஏதோ தங்களுக்கு பலத்த சக்தியிருப்பதாக எண்ணி, தங்களால் சாதிக்க முடியாத காரியமேதும் இல்லையென இறுமாந்து, வரிகொடா இயக்கத்தை ஆரம்பிக்கப்போகிறோம் என்பதாக வெல்லாம் ஐந்து கண பூச்சாண்டி காணப்பிப்பில் பயனில்லை. இந்த ஈஜாஜி சர்க்கார் அந்த மாதிரியான பூச்சாண்டியைக் கண்டு பயப்பட்டுப்போவ தில்லை. இந்த சர்க்காரிடம் அவர்கள் பாச்சா எதுவும் பலிக்காது. சட்டம் வந்த பிறகும் மிராசதாரர்கள் பல புதிய புதிய தொல்லைகளை எழுப்பிக் கொண்டிருக்கவிடாமல் செனஜையுமான முறையில் விவசாயிகளுடன் ஒற்றுமையாய் வேலை செய்து உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கும்படியாக சர்க்கார் எப்பொழுதும் கண்காணித்து கொண்டேயிருக்கவேண்டும். இன்றைக்கு உழவர்க்கு ஜெயமா, மிராசதாரர்களுக்குச் ஜெயமா என்பது பிரச்சினையல்ல. எந்தத்தரப்பிற்குச் ஜெயம் என்று பார்த்து மார்த்த்டிக் கொண்டிருப்பது தோல்விவற்ற தரப்பாரின் கோபத்தை அதிகப்படுத்துவதோடு மாதிரிம் அல்ல. எதிர்த்தரப்பாரர்க்கு கிடைத்தவெற்றியினால் ஏற்படிருக்கின்ற பலனி ஏற்பட்டமுடியாதபடி செய்யத்தான் வேண்டுமென்ற மன உணர்ச்சியை இயற்கையிலேயே இருதரப்பார்களிடையேயும் ஊட்டும். ஆகவே இன்றையதினம் இருதரப்பாரின் கொள்கைகளும் நம் நாட்டின் உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணம்தான் இதில் கொள்கைவேற்றுமை இருக்க அவசியமில்லை. இதற்கானதோர் சூழ்நிலையை சர்க்கார் உருவாக்கவேண்டும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் நிலைமை சீர்பட்டவுடன் இந்த மாதிரியானதோர் நிலைமை மற்றஇப்புகளில் ஏற்படும்படியாக நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். எருக்களை தாராளமாக வினியோகம் செய்யவேண்டும். நல்ல நஞ்சை பூமியில் வாழும், கரும்பு போன்ற தானியங்களைப் பயிரிடாமல் பார்த்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். ஆக உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதற்கு என்னென்ன ஏற்பாடுகளையெல்லாம் செய்யவேண்டுமோ அதையெல்லாம் செய்யவேண்டும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா தன்னுடைய தேவை போக மிக மிக அதிகமான தானியத்தை வெளி நாட்டிற்கு ஒரு காலத்தில் ஏற்றுமதி செய்து கொண்டிருந்திருக்கிறது. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவின் தாராள கொடை மனப்பானமையையும், வளத்தையும், செழிப்பையும், வெள்ளாராமையையும், மக்களிடையே ஏற்பட்டிருந்த நாகரீகம், கலை, தெய்வ உணர்ச்சி போன்றவற்றின் சிறப்பையும் பாடாத புலவர்கள் கிடையாது. எனக்கு இப்பொழுது ஒரு பாடல் கவனத்திற்கு வருகிறது.

‘ஈதலும்பல கோலாலபூஜையும்

ஓத லும்குண ஆசார நீதியும்

ஓத லுமருண ஆசார் தத்தம்
ஈரமுங்குந சீபாத் சேவையும் மறவாத

எழுத லம்புகழ் காவேரி யாஸ் வினை

சோழ மண்டல மீதே,' என்பதாக அவர் பாடியிருக்கிறார்.

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu] [3rd December 1952]

மற்றைய ஜில்லாவாசிகளான எனது நண்பர்கள் இன்றையதினமும் சோழமண்டலம் இப்படியிருப்பதாக யாரும் கருதக் கூடாது. இன்றைய தினம் ஈதலோ, இதலோ, நீதியோ, சேவைவோ எதுவும் கிடையாது. வறுமைதான் எல்லோரிடையும் மிஞ்சிக்கிடக்கிறது. அரைபடி நெல்லுக்கு தகராறு போட்டுக்கொண்டு இன்றையதினம் ஆறு கோட்டுகள் ஏறிஇறங்கிவிடு கிறார்கள். இவைகள் எல்லாம் உண்மையில் மறைந்தாகவேண்டும். நாட்டின் உண்மை நிலைம் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியப்படியாகச் செய்ய வேண்டும். நான் படித்தகாலத்தில் ஒரு விஷயம் கவனித்திருக்கிறேன். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவை “சோழநாட்டு நெற்களஞ்சியம்,” என்பதாக அழைத்தார்கள். சொல்லிக்கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். தன் ஜில்லாவின் தேவையையொத்திரம் அது பூர்த்தி செய்து கொள்ளவில்லை. மற்றும் பல ஜில்லாக்களின் தேவைகளையும் பூர்த்தி செய்ததால்தான் அதற்கு இந்தப் பெயர் ஏற்பட்டது. விவசாய, மிராசு, ஆகிய இருதரப்பாரிடையேயும்தான் ஊக்கம் குன்றிற்று. பூசல்கள் அதிகமாயிற்று. சோம்பேறித்தனமும், சுயநல நோக்கமுமே அதிகமாக வளர்ந்து விட்டது. அவைகள் எல்லாவற்றையும் ஒரு அதிர்ச்சியை போல இந்தச் சட்டம் ஒரு தாக்கு தாக்கிவிடும். புதிய விழிப்பு, புதிய ஊக்கம் இருதரப்பாரிடையேயும் இப்பொழுது காணப் படுகிறது. ஆகவே விவசாய வளர்ச்சியைக் கருத்தில் கொண்டு இருவரும் பாடுபடும்படியாகச் செய்யவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டம் உழவருக்கு மிகவும் உதவியாக இருக்கும்படிச் செய்யவேண்டும். பல இடங்களில் பலமுள்ள மிராசுதார்கள் ஏழை விவசாயிகளை நசுக்கிவிட்டதான் பார்ப்பார்கள். அங்கே யுள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஆதரவு காட்டுவதைப்போல பலமிக்க விவசாயி காளால் மிராசுதார்களின் நலனும் சட்டத்தில் கண்டபடி அவர்கள் உரி மையை அவர்கள் அடையும்படி பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தால் பலவிடங்களிலும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஆதரவு மிகவும் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது. பெரிய குத்தகைக்காரராக இருந்தும்சூட நண்பர் சம்பந் தத்தைப் போன்றவர்கள் இன்றையதினம் குத்தகை ஒழியவேண்டுமென்று பேசுவதைக் கேட்டு மிகவும் அவர்களேப் பாராட்டுகிறேன். பலர் இம்மாதிரி இன்றையதினம் விவசாயிகளுடைய நண்பர்களாகப் பேசுவதைக் குறித் தும் மகிழ்ச்சி அடைகிறேன். இவைகளையெல்லாம் விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர் களின் வெற்றிக்கு அறிகுறியென்றே நான் கருதுகிறேன்.

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் பல குறைகள் இருப்பதாகச் சொன்னார்கள். அந்த குறைகள் எல்லாம் நிச்சயமாக நடைமுறையில் வரும்பொழுது நிவர்த்திசெய்யப்படுமென நம்புகிறேன். அதோடு மிராசுதார்கள், விவ சாயிகள், பண்ணையாட்கள் இவர்களிடையே புதியதொரு ஊக்கத்தை உண்டு பண்ணவேண்டும். யார் மிக அதிகமாக உற்பத்தி செய்கிறாரோ அவ ருக்குப் பரிசு வழங்க வேண்டிக் வேண்டும். எவ்வளவு நிலத்தில் பயிரிட்டார்கள், செலவு என்ன, என்பதையெல்லாம் வைத்துக் கொண்டு மிகக் குறைந்த நிலத்தில் யார் மிக அதிகமாக சாகுபடி செய்கிறாரோ அவருக்குப் பரிசு வழங்கவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தோடு அந்தமாதிரியாகவும் சீர்திருத்தங் கள் வந்தால் நிச்சயமாக மிகவும் அதிகமாக உணவு உற்பத்தி செய்யப் படும்கூட.

“மிராசுதார்களின் சலசலப்பைக் கண்டு இந்தச் சர்க்கார் அஞ்சாது என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். ஆகையால் தைரியமாக இந்தச் சட்டத்தை விவசாய மக்களின் நலனில் அக்கறையுடைய ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்ததற் காக நான் விவசாயப் பெருமக்கள் சார்பாக கனம் முதல் மந்திரி அவர் களுக்கும் ரெயின்யூ மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கும், இந்தச் சபையிலுள்ளோர் களுக்கும்கூட எனது நன்றியை தெரிவித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“മാനന്തല അദ്ധ്യക്ഷനവർ കേളേ! ഈ ഹാളിൽ പല ഭക്ഷകളിലും പാത്രപത്തിലും ഈ നിയമത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു കേൾക്കും പ്രസംഗങ്ങൾ ചെയ്യുകയുണ്ടു. എന്നാൽ എനിക്ക് പറയാനുള്ളതു മലയാളികളായ എം.എൽ.എ. മാർ ഈ Tanjore ബില്ലിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു ഉള്ള വാദപ്രതിവാദങ്ങളിൽ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് കൈക്കൊള്ളുന്ന നിലപാടു് സന്തോഷം പരിശോധിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുവാൻ. എന്തുകൊണ്ടെന്നാൽ മലബാർ കടിയായു ദേശത്തി നിയമം ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ ആലോചനയിൽ ഉണ്ടെന്നാണല്ലോ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട റവന്യൂ മന്ത്രി അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടതു്.”

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar]

എന്നാൽ 'ഭാവിശ്രദ്ധപി ക്രമശക്തം കണ്ടുപോൽ' എന്ന പറയുന്നപോലെ ഈ തഞ്ചാവൂർ ഫിഫ്തിനെ പററിയുള്ള ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ നിലപാടു കണ്ടപ്പോൾ വരാന്തി കുന്ന മലമ്പാർ കുടിയായു ഭേദഗതി നിയമത്തിന്റെ ഭാവിയിലുപരി 'കഷ്ടം' എന്ന ഒരു വാക്കുകൊണ്ടു അതിരിട്ടു കളയേണ്ടിവരില്ല എന്ന ന്യായമായി സംശയിക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്ന. ഞാൻ ഇത്രയും പറയുവാനുള്ള കാരണം വളരെ പ്രധാനങ്ങളായ ഉപദേശപങ്ങൾ കൊണ്ടുവന്നതെല്ലാംതന്നെ ഈ നിയമം അല്ലാലികമാണ്; partial, experimental, temporary എന്നുള്ള വാക്കുകൾ പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു തള്ളിക്കളയുകയും, ബില്ലിന്റെ ജീവശ്വാസം വെട്ടിത്തുടയ്ക്കുകയും ചെയ്തു എന്നുള്ള കാരണമായിരിക്കുന്നു. തഞ്ചാവൂരിൽ കുടിയാന്മാരും ജന്മിമാരും തമ്മിലുള്ള ബന്ധത്തിൽ അല്പം അധവാനമു restore ചെയ്യുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയാണ് അല്ലാലികമായി ഈ നിയമം കൊണ്ടുവന്നത് എന്നു പറയുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ഏതൊരു നിയമത്തിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശ്യം അതു അദ്ധ്വാനിക്കുന്ന കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു അവർ ഉണ്ടാകുന്ന ഉല്പാദനം അനുദിനവർദ്ധനുള്ള അവകാശം കൊടുക്കുന്നതോ എന്നും ഭൂമിയുടെ മേൽ അവനെ ന്യായമായ അവകാശം കൊടുക്കുന്നതോ എന്നാണു്. ഇതു രണ്ടും വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ഈ ബില്ലുകൊണ്ടു കുടിയാന്മാർക്കു സിദ്ധിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഒരു ഉദാഹരണം, Sir, ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞു കൊള്ളട്ടേ. ഭൂമിയിൽ ശാശ്വതമായ അവകാശം കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു കൊടുക്കണമെന്നാണ് ആരുടെ അവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിരുന്നത്. അതു് ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടപ്പോൾ തള്ളിവോക്കുകയാണു ചെയ്തതു്. പാണ്ഡവന്മാർക്കുവേണ്ടി ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണൻ ദുരൂഹവന്മാരെടു് പറയുകയാണ്: അന്ത്യ രാജ്യമെങ്കിലും കൊടുക്കുക, അല്ലെങ്കിൽ അഞ്ചു വീഴ്ചകളെങ്കിലും പാണ്ഡവന്മാർക്കു കൊടുക്കണം. അതുമില്ലെന്നു പറഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ അഞ്ചു വീഴ്ചകളെങ്കിലും കൊടുക്കുക എന്നായി. ഈ ആവശ്യം പോലും നിരസിച്ചപ്പോൾ ഒരു വീട്കളിലും അവർക്കു കൊടുക്കണം എന്നു് ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണൻ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അതുപോലെ നിങ്ങൾ കുടിയാന്മാർക്കു സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കുകയില്ലെങ്കിൽ പാവപ്പെട്ട കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു വളരെ കൊല്ലത്തേക്കെങ്കിലും സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കണം എന്നാണ് ആരുടെ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടതു്. എത്രയും മിതവും ന്യായവുമായ ഈ ആവശ്യംകൂടി നിഷ്ക്കരണം തള്ളിക്കളയുകയാണ് ചെയ്തതു്. സാധ്യ കൃഷിക്കാർ അവരുടെ അവകാശങ്ങൾക്കു വേണ്ടി പോരാടിയപ്പോൾ കോണഗ്രസ്സും ബീഗ് സേഡ് ഫിതന്മാരും പറയാറുണ്ട്: ഇതു കമ്മ്യൂണിസ്റ്റ് കാര്യം പ്രക്ഷോഭമാണ്, ഹിംസയാണ് എന്നൊക്കെ. പക്ഷെ പത്തുകൊല്ലത്തേക്കെങ്കിലും ഭൂമിയിൽ സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കണം എന്നു പറഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ അതിന്നു എതിരായി വോട്ടുചെയ്തു, കുടിയാന്നു അവന്റെ ഭൂമിയിൽ ശാശ്വത അവകാശം ഇല്ലായ്മചെയ്യുവാൻ വോട്ടു ചെയ്തു് മ്യൂസിം ബീഗ് മെമ്പർമാരെയും മറ്റും മലമ്പാറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാർ നോക്കിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കും. ഇതു അവർ മറക്കുകയില്ല എന്നു ഞാൻ പ്രഖ്യാപിച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടേ. മറ്റൊരു സംഗതി കൃഷിക്കാർ പോരാടിയ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ അതിന്റെ അനുഭവം ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ട്. ഇതു തെളിയിക്കുന്നതു കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു സംബന്ധിച്ചേക്കുന്നതും സ്ഥാപിത താല്പര്യങ്ങളെ സംരക്ഷിച്ചുപോരുന്ന ഈ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് സംഘടിപ്പിക്കാൻ അവരുടെ ആവശ്യങ്ങൾക്കുവേണ്ടി അങ്ങേ അററം പോരാട്ടിട്ടില്ലെങ്കിൽ യാതൊന്നും ചെയ്യുവാൻ വോക്കുന്നില്ല എന്നതാണ്. ഇതുകൊണ്ടുതന്നെയാണ് സംസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെ മറ്റു ഭാഗങ്ങളിലേക്കും ഈ നിയമം വ്യാപിപ്പിക്കണം എന്ന ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടപ്പോൾ അതു് സാധ്യമല്ല എന്നു പറയുവാനുള്ള കാരണം. ഏതായാലും ഈ ചൈതന്യവേളയിലേങ്കിലും ഇങ്ങിനെ ഒരു ബില്ലിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചേക്കുന്നതും ആങ്ങളുടെ അഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ അറിഞ്ഞിരിക്കെ വരാന്തിരിക്കുന്ന മലമ്പാർ കുടിയായു ഭേദഗതി ബിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന അവസരത്തിൽ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ന്യായമായ അവകാശങ്ങളും ഭൂമിയിലുള്ള സ്ഥിരാവകാശവും അനുവദിക്കുവാൻ ഉള്ള ഒരു ഹൃദയം ഉണ്ടാകണമെന്നു സവിന്യം അറിയിക്കുവാൻ ഞാൻ ഈ അവസരം ഉപയോഗിച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടേ !”

* SRI B. LAKSHMINARASA RAJU :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ తంజావూరు 5-10 p.m.
 బిల్లుపై ఆసేకమంది ఆసేక సభరణలు పెట్టి మాట్లాడారు. ఆయితే వాటికి ఎంత ప్రాముఖ్యత ఉన్నాయి! ఆసే విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించినట్లయితే ఒకదానికొకదా తగినటువంటి ప్రాముఖ్యతను ఇవ్వకపోగా, వాటిని చాలా ఆవమానకరంగా చూశారని నేను ఆభిప్రాయపడుతున్నాను. ఎందుకనగా ఉదాహరణకు మా పశ్చిమ గోదావరి జిల్లా ఈవిషయములూ తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు కొంచెము హెచ్చుతక్కువగా సమపోలికగా, అదే పరిస్థితులు కలిగిఉన్నది ఆలాంబపుడుకూడా ఈ పట్టాన్ని ఆ జిల్లాకు వర్తించేయలేదు. మా జిల్లానుంచి ఈ విషయమును గురించును ఆసేక పేటికనులు పెట్టు

[Sri B. Lakshminarasa Raju]

[3rd December 1952]

కొన్నారు. కాని, వాటికి ఏమీకూడ సరియైనటువంటి సమాధానము ఇచ్చినట్లు లేదు. అక్కడ పరిస్థితులను చూచినట్లయితే, ఉదాహరణకు, 1949 లో ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రములో వచ్చినటువంటి cyclone గురించి పంటలుపోయి అక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి రైతులు చాల ఇబ్బందులకు పాలైనారు. పంటలు పోవుటచే చాలామంది రైతులు చివరకు గ్రామాలలో వాళ్లకు ఉన్నటువంటి ఆస్తిని చిన్న చిన్న వస్తువులు పూసలు పుస్తెలు మొదలుకొని అన్నిటిని ఆమ్మిచ్చి కోర్టులలో డిక్రీలు పొందారు యీనానందారులు. అక్కడ రైతులు అవిధముగా ఎన్ని కష్టములు పడుచున్నప్పటికీ ఇప్పుడు ఈ తంజావూరు Ordinance ను జిల్లాకుకూడ వర్తింపజేయబడుతుందని వారు గత కష్టాలనన్నింటిని మరచిపోయి ఆ రైతులు ఎంతో ఆశిస్తున్నారు. వారి ఆశలన్నీ ఈ రోజుతో నిరాశరై పోయే పరిస్థితి వచ్చింది. అందుచేత ఈ పరిస్థితులలో ఈ బిల్లును సాధ్యమైనంత వరకు ఇతర జిల్లాలకును, ముఖ్యంగా పశ్చిమ గోదావరి జిల్లాలంటివాటికి తప్పక వర్తింపజేసేటట్లుగానైనా చూడాలని కోరుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమించుచున్నాను.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Ordinance was first issued, I was one of those who welcomed it for certain of its provisions, namely, the provisions relating to the security of tenure. Of course, Sir, I do not like legislation by Ordinance but all the same, when it was once issued and it had a good provision giving security of tenure to the tenants who never had such benefit for centuries, I thought it was a good thing to that extent. Subsequently when it was announced that legislation would be introduced, I thought that legislation would be introduced to make it applicable to the whole State and I did not imagine that legislation will be introduced merely to regularize the Ordinance because, Sir, as you are aware, under the present Constitution no law is necessary to regularize an Ordinance and an Ordinance has got a certain period of life and if they want to make a general law, then general legislation could be introduced. But, Sir, unfortunately it has not been so done. You have heard from both sides of the House that several Members were anxious to have legislation applicable to the whole State. It is true that there is difference of opinion with regard to certain aspects, namely, with regard to sharing of produce and also the period of tenancy right. Some are inclined to give permanent occupancy right straightway and some are not willing to do so on the ground that it will amount to expropriation and so, this has to be very carefully looked into. You are aware, Sir, in the discussion of the clauses relating to that subject, there was more or less general agreement that at least a ten-year period of security must be given to the tenants and I really hoped that the Government would agree to that at least in respect of Tanjore so that hereafter they could come forward with a Bill which is applicable to the whole State. At that time, Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister observed that if I gave him a Bill, he would consider it and you remember, Sir, that I told him that I would give the Bill. May I tell the Hon. the Chief Minister now, Sir, that I have given notice of a Bill already and I have handed it over to the office and if the Speaker is good enough and if the Hon. the Chief Minister is willing enough, he will please give me an opportunity to enable me to move for the first reading of the Bill tomorrow because tomorrow is a non-official day. Also, Sir, it is a formal

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

matter. I do not go to the very extreme, although desirable, step with which there is no general agreement and I am making a provision for a ten-year period of security as a temporary measure pending further agrarian legislation.

"Sir, I need not go into further details. I only hope the various clauses which are unduly weighted against the tenants will not be harshly worked. I also hope, Sir, that not merely the behaviour of the tenants but also the behaviour of the landlords will be such that clause 10 of the Bill will not be put into effect and there will be no need to go to the Revenue Divisional Officer or to the Conciliation Officer with applications for eviction. I hope, Sir, after this Bill there will be some contentment and if in the working of the measure the spirit with which the provisions are made are observed by the landlords and also the officers concerned, I hope the penal clauses of the Bill and the eviction clauses will not be put in operation. I hope that the best of luck will befall the tenants of Tanjore and I wish Godspeed to the Bill."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to say not very much because the Bill has been discussed threadbare at every stage and I do not think there is any point remaining for further explanation or elucidation. We can only deal with the general prospect before us as a result of this legislation. On the one hand, I have been reading in the newspapers, as was referred to by some of the previous speakers, that landowners of Tanjore, at any rate landholders of certain parts of the district, have met and have expressed their severe displeasure in regard to certain provisions incorporated in the Bill and they have gone so far as to use pretty minatory language and they have said they will have to resort to methods followed for attaining the independence of the country. I am, however, not much disturbed by such threats. I am only grieved at the spirit behind such language. On the other hand, Mr. Ramamurthi is here and he says that there is no reason whatsoever for him after the passage of the Bill to wind up his agitation. And so, I was ruminating over the prospect. On the one hand landowners are thoroughly dissatisfied—I do not wish to minimise their dissatisfaction because it is a fact that they are thoroughly dissatisfied—nobody will deny that; it is not merely pretence. It is not merely a sort of strategy or anything like that; they are thoroughly dissatisfied. On the other hand, I must take it at full value what has been said in front of me here by Mr. Ramamurthi: he is not going to wind up his agitation. Not that I ever believed that the party which he represents will wind up its agitation; it is an international organization with a long life and with a history behind it of a series of events and programmes and it could not be wound up by the Tanjore Tenants Protection Bill. Their agitation is only a part of their general attitude to life and to Government; it is not only a part but a temporary phase. What I mean by this description is that this is not what they stand for and what they ask for here is not what they stand for.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[3rd December 1952]

5-20
p.m.

" Sir, I know their philosophy fairly well—may be not so much as ardent and loyal members of the Party like Mr. Venkateswarlu and others do. They do not believe in the magic of property to which the old economists were wedded. When they argue now that the permanent interest in the land should be given to A or B or C or a tenant or whosoever it may be, in order that he may improve it and look after it well, they are talking only my language or the language of the Right and not of the Left. Really their doctrine is that property is not necessary, it is not essential and it is an illusion. They depend upon public interest, upon patriotism, upon general economic laws and the class struggle. They do not depend upon the magic of property. Yet, as a temporary phase, Mr. Ramamurthi unabashedly says, we must give an interest to any man if he is to look after production, to look after cultivation and the like. It is not that I do not like it. For the time being he agrees with me on that aspect of life. But that is not their final opinion. So, I say, the prospect is, on the one hand, the landowners are saying that this is a war upon them and Rajaji is in Ramamurthi's pocket and he has handed himself over, body and soul, to the Communists and that Ramamurthi, in fact, drafted this Bill and I have only adopted it by ' *sweekaram* ' and therefore their life is at stake and they must fight to death. On the other hand, at the end of all this trouble, Mr. Ramamurthi gives me the cheering information that they will continue their agitation. The whole object of my endeavour was not to kill any particular doctrine. Not that I believe that any doctrine could be stopped in this manner but I had hoped for calm, I had hoped for peace but he denies me that. And yet I know that in all our legislative and other efforts, really we make a great deal of noise while we are involved in it. But life will go on, apart from this legislation and apart from anything else we do. So many things are done in this world. There is a great deal of noise and tumult about it, and debate and discussion and hard swearing, but life goes on by the force of tradition and the force of habit. Luckily for us, in spite of every disturbance, the landowner by force of tradition takes some interest in the land. The cultivators too, by force of tradition and habit take some interest in the land. A man cannot keep quiet and he must work on something. Otherwise he cannot be happy. So, by force of habit and tradition, I believe that the lands in the Tanjore district and elsewhere will continue to be looked after in spite of us, either on this side or on the other side. I do hope, therefore, that in spite of what the mirasidars say at their meetings and in spite of what Mr. Ramamurthi says here, still there is something to protect us all by way of tradition and habit. Orderly life alone gives us happiness. Anything else might give us excitement, a little temporary joy but, what is called happiness will result only from permanent things. I think, the forces of Nature will help us in spite of the discussions that have been going on here. In spite of adverse criticism, Members desire the law to cover the whole State and not only Tanjore. It is curious that Mr. Anthoni Pillai drew a different moral from it for a different purpose. But it gave me continual satisfaction to

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

see Member after Member rising and speaking in various languages, that the Bill should have been extended to the whole of the State. A person might pick holes and make disparaging comments but ultimately when a man comes and says "Give me your daughter's hand", I know he is happy over and likes my 'daughter.' Therefore, I say, that this Bill, in spite of every criticism either on this side or on the other side, is welcomed by all. But, it is said that a mistake has been committed in not extending it to the other parts of the State. I feel an internal satisfaction that they really desire that it should be extended to other districts. So, there is something in my 'daughter.' (Laughter.)

"Sir, I accept the blessings of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition with very great satisfaction and pleasure. He has not only argued and he has not only set out points but he has wound up the debate like a true Brahman and wished good luck and God-speed to this Bill. Let us all disperse this evening saying God-speed to this Bill because it affects the lives of so many people.

"Now, the question is, what have I done and what this Bill proposes to do. Before I go to that, I know that people take sides. Yet I was greatly surprised at the mirasidars' discontent with my proposals. Even leading organs of the Press, whom I may count as my friends for all purposes in general, expressed grave dissatisfaction. Members have spoken here that 40 per cent is not good enough. But one of the most prominent supporters of the nationalist movement in India and one of the foremost newspapers of our land not only of this part of the country, was thoroughly dissatisfied with the proportion that we had adumbrated in the Ordinance itself, viz., two-fifths for the tenants. It was too much, they said, and there is reason for that. Mr. Venkatrama Ayyar pointed out that in most parts of Tanjore, in a large part of Tanjore, in a very important part of Tanjore, in a very fertile part of Tanjore, where land is very costly, where the channels are full of water and where the men are full of intelligence—both in mathematics and other matters they have been paying much less than what this Bill now proposes to give by law to the tenants. Only a fifth was the average in that area but we have doubled it, so to say. As I explained in the earlier phase of the discussion, that has given dissatisfaction both to my friends who do not want to wind up their agitation and to my friends on the landlords' side. The landlords say, 'We were paying only a fifth. Now it is suddenly raised to two-fifths.' Whereas my friends, the non-winders of agitation, say 'You are giving where we agitated only very little above what the people are already being given. You give much where we did not agitate.' I do not want to dilate upon it. I only want to say that people are discontented all round. Yet I hope, the whole of the House will hope for good coming out of the endeavours we are making honestly. I hope, at the end of the debate, my friends on the other side will give us the credit for having honest motives. They began by saying that it was intended

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [3rd December 1952]

to kill this and kill that, but I believe that attitude was only temporary and that at the end of it, we all unanimously believe that we desire to do something well. Only some people think that we might have done more. Some people think that we might have done less. But that does not matter. Let us hope that something will come out of this. I firmly believe that by the force of habits and traditions, men will take interest not only in their land and the welfare of their families but also in the welfare of the people round about them. Ultimately, everything will come all right.

5-30
p.m.

“ Now what have we done in this Bill? I wish to dwell for a minute on this point. We have reinstated all the tenants who were turned out as a result of disappointed hopes and fears and frustrations after the publication of the Subramaniam Committee Report. We have reinstated all of them. Mr. Ramamurthi and others wanted us to go a stage further. When we referred this Bill to a Select Committee we took time to discuss this matter at some length and it is as a result of that we have given rights of reinstatement up to a certain date back. We have also given them fixity of term. Each term is fixed. The term which till now was one year has been made into a five-year term. The one-year tenant has now become a five-year tenant. Any one let in must be accepted for five years. We have also left no doubt as to his share. We have, I think, on the whole, made provisions here, in this Bill, for a fairly generous distribution of the produce. Some arguments were heard that two-fifths was not enough. Let us improve it later if necessary. Two-fifths is not an eternal fraction. We have put it now. Let us hope it will grow, adjust or alter later; it does not matter. We have begun well and I think not ill. We have provided that the produce, if there would be any dispute about it, shall be divided on the basis of two-fifths to the tenant, and not less favourable than two-fifths. If by any process of adjustment an agreement should be entered into, by which the tenant will get something more, this Bill will not stand in his way.

“ It was mentioned that the power of collective bargaining should be retained. Both Mr. Ramamurthi and Mr. Anthony Pillai referred to it. Each referred to it in his own way. They said that we should retain the power to get more from the landowner. By all means let people bargain. But let us have peace. Much has been talked about trade unionism and collective bargaining. Each is intimately associated with the doctrine of property. It is only when Government's hands are off private enterprise that collective bargaining becomes a necessity in order that justice may be secured to the workers as against managements and capitalists. But now we are in the midst of an endeavour to establish a Welfare State where we are entitled to interfere in everything. In the management of production we are entitled to take over property, to control management, to control transport and to control movement, and all that. Therefore the State steps in in order to render justice, and there is democracy to make the State do the right thing. With the State taking care of all enterprises and of

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

production, at any rate when our creed is that we may interfere in all things, in a Welfare State and with democracy to control the State, collective bargaining becomes an old-fashioned slogan which has to be given up. Trade-unionism has no more place. All that it can do is to create confusion in the minds of the people. It has some place as there is still property and private enterprise."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" They are retiring."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" But there should be some restriction on collective bargaining, and that is the issue of the mixed position in which we are now to-day. There can be what is called collective bargaining but it can be allowed only to the extent it is good for the State."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" It recedes to the extent there is a Welfare State."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" All things grow gradually. It is well known that we stand for a Welfare State. Collective bargaining has lost force as a slogan. It cannot have the force now as it had before. It may remain to supplement our efforts. I hope hon. Members when they work among the agrarian population will remember that a Welfare State is postponed to the extent that peace is disturbed. Welfare State and peace must go together. Otherwise we cannot produce a Welfare State. I must say here what I already said in another place. I think it is worthwhile to repeat it here and so I repeat it here; my Friends will excuse my playing the schoolmaster to some extent. It is this. Communists know that they have not a leg to stand on unless they yoke their doctrines, unless they yoke their policies to hard work, and lay down that every man should work according to capacity and fully. The doctrine of work is no less important to the Communist way of thinking than it is to the Bhagavat Gita way of thinking. Work is an essential duty and an essential condition for success according to the Communist organization. Now can we by slowing down and strikes, by encouraging a habit of not working or working less or ill, by asking the people not to work—can we produce an ideal condition of things? I would like to give here a thought to the Communists to work on. By doing something opposite to what they ultimately want they are postponing the goal to which they are moving. We must at every stage tell the people to work, we must at every stage emphasize the sacredness and the duty of working. Without disturbing that mentality they may do anything else according to their doctrines. Let my friends agitate; I have no objection. But I do not want them to tell anybody not to work, or tell anybody to stop work or slow down work. Provided they follow this advice, I do not mind what other trouble they may bring me or to the Government; I do not mind all that. (Laughter.) Work is essential.

" We have also done some minor things in this Bill. We have said that though it was the custom from time immemorial to debit

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [3rd December 1952]

the entire cost of manuring and all that to the tenant's share, it has become now legalised that the landowner must bear half the cost of manuring expenditure and the tenant only the other half. No doubt this was suggested by the landowners, because they got nothing by putting a load of debt on the tenants; so they said 'let us legitimise this provision.' Mr. Ramamurthi wanted not only that the landowner should bear half the cost but that he should loan the other half to the tenant. I said it was left to them to accommodate as they liked; we cannot make it compulsory that the one should lend and the other should borrow.

"As for the catch crops, Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar has explained that what is given to the landowner is only a trifle; we have given them away almost entirely to the tenant. What is given to the landowner is mere symbolic trifle. The landowner wants *ulundu* and *payaru* for his iddli and other things he wants for his kitchen. It is absurd that a landowner who owns large extents of land, at least according to law, should have to go to the market to buy a little *ulundu* or to buy straw for his cattle. So I said, 'will you be content with one-fifth of the produce.' In this I have not given anything much. It is a trifling thing; the catch crop is grown in between crops and so it does not very much matter even if the tenant took the whole of it. But anyhow we have provided a share in it for the landowner.

"In this Bill something has been done for the landowners and something for the tenants. Much has been done for the pannaiyals, more than for the others. Mr. Vinayakam does not like the word 'pannaiyal.' One who knows Tamil need not object to it. 'Pan' or 'Pannai' means farm, field, cultivation and labour for the farm and 'al' means man. Therefore there is nothing wrong in the word. There is everything good in it just as everything is good in the word 'Pappan.' It is now used to mean a bad fellow. The word 'Pappan' means one who sees, one who can read, one who could explain the scriptures to others, one to whom we go if the calendar should be read, to know when Amavasi comes, when it is a good day or a bad day and all that. It means 'one who sees.' But now it has come to mean the hated Brahman. The meaning of words changes according to conduct. Luckily the pannaiyal has not done anything wrong; he has not changed. Let not anybody object to it. It means no more than when one is called a bicycle man or a coachman or a postman. Pannaiyal is only a 'field man' or 'cultivation man.' There is nothing wrong in the word 'pannaiyal.' His position has been considerably strengthened in this Bill. He cannot be dismissed; he can take the landlord to court if he is dismissed, the tenant also may be taken to court if his pannaiyal is dismissed. His wages are fixed and made liberal.

5-40 p.m. "There is nothing wrong in any of the provisions and nobody has commented adversely on these points. He has got security of service. Apart from non-dismissal, there is the provision that he has to get twelve full months' notice before he can be sent away.

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

He has full twelve months ending with the agricultural year so that he can find his occupation elsewhere. So far as the pannaiyals are concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that this law has done well by them. As regards the tenants, it is a thing yet to be seen how co-operation will proceed. If my hopes are fulfilled there would be co-operation. Let me tell my Communist Friends, 'By all means do not wind up your agitation but I would request you not immediately to open the bag. Allow the Bill to have full play.' It is easy to create trouble. There is no difficulty. One man can create trouble among fifty or a hundred people. It is difficult to put down trouble because in the process of putting down trouble much other trouble arises. So, nobody wants to put down trouble by force. I hope that all Members will join and follow the lead of the Leader of the Opposition who is leading the United Democratic Front and I also hope that with the Leader, the rest also will say 'God-speed' to the Bill. Sir, this is all that I wish to say and I hope the House will accept the Bill unhesitatingly and without any mental demur."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

'That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, be passed into law.'

The motion was carried *nem. con.* and the Bill was passed into law.

(2) THE INDIAN REGISTRATION (MADRAS AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, and move—

'That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.'

"It is a very simple matter. There were disputes between the French and British Governments as to which of them possessed sovereign jurisdiction over the loges at Kozhikode and Masulipatnam. The British Government had asserted their sovereign jurisdiction over the loges in unmistakable terms. But documents relating to the properties in the loges have in some cases been registered in French registration offices as the parties concerned were under the mistaken impression that the French authorities had jurisdiction over the loges. As the loges have been specifically included in the territory of India by a Statutory Order of the Government of India (S.O. No. 6, dated the 23rd March 1948), it is considered desirable to permit these documents to be re-registered under the Indian Registration Act, 1908 (XVI of 1908), free of all charges, so that they may be admitted in evidence in Indian courts. Sub-section (1) of new section 23-B inserted by the Bill makes provision accordingly; and sub-section (2) provides for the application of sub-section (1) to other French Indian areas adjoining Madras territory, in respect of which similar difficulties may be experienced in future."

[3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

' That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.' "

SRI C. V. K. RAO :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to have certain clarifications on this Bill. Why were these documents registered in French registration offices as the loges were specifically included in the territory of India by a Statutory Order of the Government of India in 1948 and why is it that the Government have not taken steps to get those documents registered in India? I also wish to know whether the French authorities have violated international law by getting such documents which ought to be registered in Indian territory, registered in French registration offices and what steps the Government of India have taken in this respect? I want a clarification on these points from the Hon. Minister who has introduced this Bill, Sir."

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—" Sir, it was a genuine mistake because these patches of land were in the midst of French territory and the documents were registered by mistake in French registration offices. It would put the people concerned into great difficulty unless these documents are re-registered in Indian territory and that is the reason for bringing forward this Bill. We have also taken the permission of the Government of India for introducing this Bill."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be taken into consideration at once.' "

The motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER :—" We shall now take up the consideration of the Bill clause by clause."

Clause 2.

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" Sir, I beg to move—

' That in clause 2, sub-clause (1) (c) omit the sentence
" and if any document is so registered, the registration
shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which
the document was originally registered by the official
referred to in clause (b) ' "

This Bill proposes that documents relating to properties situated in areas which have been set out in the Schedule to the Madras (Enlargement of Areas and Alteration of Boundaries) Order, 1948, which are compulsorily registrable under the Indian Registration Act but have been registered in French registration offices be re-registered free of all charges, within such time and subject to such restrictions and conditions as may be specified in the notification; and if any document is so registered, the registration shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which the document was originally registered in a French registration office. By this

3rd December 1952] [Sri K. R. Viswanathan]

particular sentence the Government propose to give retrospective effect to the registration of such documents effected in Indian territory. I do not know what is going to be achieved by this provision. In fact, it is meaningless."

MR. SPEAKER:—"If it is meaningless, why should the hon. Member insist on pressing his amendment?"

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN:—"Sir, as it is quite meaningless I want this sentence to be deleted from the Bill. A document is the evidence of a contract or a settlement arrived at between two or more parties. It is probable that the parties may break the contract or the terms of the settlement; or the document itself is liable to be lost. In order to prevent a breach of contract and, in cases of loss of the documents, to protect the interests of both the parties concerned, the Indian Registration Act came to the rescue of the people. By registering a document the Government recognize the validity of the terms of a contract enumerated in the document itself. The Government also recognize the contract between the parties and also give publicity to the contract. By registering a document, it becomes admissible in a Court of Law as evidence from the date of execution. This amending Bill has been brought forward to make admissible in evidence in Courts of Law in India by re-registering in Indian territory documents relating to property situated in the loges at Kozhikode and Masulipatnam and such other areas as are in French territory, which were originally registered in French registration offices. Mere registration in Indian territory makes the documents admissible in evidence in Courts of Law in India. Therefore, there is no necessity to give retrospective effect to the registration of these documents from the dates on which they were registered in registration offices in French India. This is my object in moving this amendment."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am seconding the amendment moved by the hon. Member, Sri K. R. Viswanathan, having full faith in his arguments, as the hon. Mover of the amendment is talking from his personal knowledge as he also happened to be a Sub-Registrar once."

MR. SPEAKER:—"Amendment moved—

'That in clause 2, sub-clause (1) (c) omit the sentence "and if any document is so registered, the registration shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which the document was originally registered by the official referred to in clause (b) "'."

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment really goes to the very root of this Bill. If the amendment is accepted the object of the legislation will be lost. Some people under a mistaken impression have registered documents in French registration offices. This, they should not have done. If those documents are now re-registered under the Indian Registration Act, the registration shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which the documents were originally

[Sri K. Venkataswami Naidu] [3rd December 1952]

registered. This legislation has been brought only for this purpose and I hope the hon. Member who moved the amendment will appreciate the purpose of this legislation. I request him to withdraw the amendment. The main idea of the legislation is to give retrospective effect so that the registration of documents under the Indian Registration Act shall have effect for all purposes from the dates on which they were originally registered in the loges at Kozhikode and Masulipatnam and in certain other areas in French India."

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, once a document is executed, some conditions are imposed for registering the document. It has got to bear some stamps. It has got to be presented at the Registration Office within a particular period. The registration makes the document valid for purposes of evidence from the date of the execution of the document. Irrespective of the date of registration, it is admissible in a Court of Law as evidence. The fact that a document is registered in the Indian territory under the Indian Registration Act is enough to make it admissible as evidence in a Court of Law in India. It is not necessary to give retrospective effect to the date of registration in French India . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The legislation is only intended to make it doubly sure that retrospective effect is given from the date of registration in French India."

* SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" Sir, let me make my point clear. The properties are situated in a disputed area. Till now the documents have been registered only in French India. They have now to be registered in the Indian Union territory, under the Indian Registration Act. It is enough if the documents are registered in the Registration offices in India and it is not necessary that the date of registration should be taken back to the date of registration in French India."

SRI K. RAJARAM :—" Let the hon. Member explain whether there is any harm in having that sentence."

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" I consider it unnecessary."

MR. SPEAKER :—" If the hon. Mover of the amendment presses his amendment, I will put it to the vote of the House."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, on this question there is no political opposition. We would like to know what exactly is the difficulty of the hon. Member who moved the amendment. It is not clear whether this clause providing retrospective effect cures any defect in the originally registered document. As far as I am able to understand the Bill, that is the only point requiring clarification."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I wish to know from the hon. Mover of the amendment whether he is withdrawing his amendment."

3rd December 1952]

SRI K. R. VISWANATHAN :—" I am not withdrawing it."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In clause 2, sub-clause (1) (c), the sentence " and if any document is so registered, the registration shall have effect for all purposes from the date on which the document was originally registered by the official referred to in clause (b) " be omitted '."

The amendment was lost.

Clause 2 was put and carried.

Clause 1 and the Preamble were put and carried.

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—" I beg to move—

' *That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.* ' "

MR. SPEAKER :—" Motion moved—

' *That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.* ' "

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not claim any expert knowledge on this matter. In view of the amendment moved by the hon. Member Sri K. R. Viswanathan having been defeated, I expect the Hon. Minister to explain why there is absolutely no necessity for such an amendment."

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—" It has been found, in actual practice, that a lot of hardship is being caused to people who have registered their documents in the French Registration offices. The Legal Department has brought to the notice of the Government that this legislation is absolutely essential. If this Bill is not given retrospective effect, it will cause great hardship to the parties concerned, and the Bill will serve no purpose."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' *That the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, be passed into law.* ' "

The motion was carried and the Bill was passed into law.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The House will be meeting at 2 p.m. tomorrow instead of at 10-30 a.m. as stated in the Agenda. I now adjourn the House till 2 p.m. tomorrow."

The House then adjourned.

INDEX TO MADRAS LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY DEBATES

THIRD SESSION OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY UNDER THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

Volume V (Nos. 1 to 11).

3rd to 7th and 24th to 27th November and 2nd and 3rd
December 1952.

	A	PAGES
Aboriginals—		
Question <i>re</i> dispossession of lands of— in Wynad		296
Adjournment of the House on Fridays for Muslim prayers		405
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> —		
Agrarian discontent in the Romperu Drain area		792
Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service Officer	1010-1011	
Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts	1011-1013	
Educational concessions to backward class students		792
Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands		687-690
Famine and Food policy of the Madras Government		792-793
Famine and unemployment in Kakinada taluk		792
Famine in Malabar district		792
Famine in Nellore district		791, 792
Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order		899
Landless labourers, Government Order <i>re</i> grant of lands to—		791-792
Landless poor, eviction of— in Musaveli village in Tanjore district		685-687
Potti Sriramulu's fast on the Andhra State issue		554-557
Price of varam paddy		792
Rent for grazing lands in Kankiri taluk, forcible collection of—		791
Retrenchment of workers in Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar		552-554
Starvation deaths in Guntur district		791
Students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in schools		793-796
Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovur taluks (West Godavari)		1013-1014
Adjournment Motions—		
Rules <i>re</i> —		789-790
		1008-1010
Administrative Machinery—		
Resolution <i>re</i> Economy and efficiency in		306-376
Agrarian discontent—		
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> — in Romperu drain Area		792
Agricultural College, Bapatla—		
Question <i>re</i> lands acquired for— inadequacy of compensation for		20-21
Agricultural Demonstrators—		
Question <i>re</i> Scales of pay of—		891
Agricultural farms—		
Question <i>re</i> —		
Particulars of—in Pudukottal division		1007
Starting of model—in each district		195-196

A—cont.

Agricultural labourers—		
Question <i>re</i> minimum wages for —	657-659	
Agricultural loans—		
Question <i>re</i> grant of — to Harijans and Harijan Christians in West Godavari district	1006	
Anantha Pai, Sri T.—		
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	62-65	
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		
Andhra Desa Libraries Conference—		
Question <i>re</i> Resolutions passed by the — implementation of ..	21-22	
Andhra Paper Mills—		
Question <i>re</i> working of the —	304	
Andhra State—		
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast for the formation of the —	554-557	
Anjaneyulu, Sri G.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	913	
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	130-131	
Anthony Pillai, Sri S. C. C.—		
Bills—		
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	405-408	
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1050-1052	
Appa Rao, Sri M. R.—		
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		
Appu, Sri A.—		
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		
Aranganathan, Sri K.—		
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		
Ardhanari, Sri T. S.—		
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	133-134	
Ari Gowder, Sri H. B.—		
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	122-123	
Arson—		
Question <i>re</i> commission of — in Chirakkal taluk in 1948-49.. ..	17-18	
Artesian wells—		
Question <i>re</i> — in South Arcot district	680, 681 986-987	
Artisans—		
Questions <i>re</i> supply of tools to — in Nellore district under Firka Development Scheme	547-548	
Arts College, Cuddapah—		
Question <i>re</i> dramatic performances for collecting funds for hostel of —	679	
Arumugam, Sri R. S.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	174-175	
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		
Arunachalam, Sri A. J.—		
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	71-77	
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		
Assignment of land—		
<i>See</i> Land.		
Audinarayana Reddi, Sri Y.—		
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		

	B	PAGES
Backward Classes—		
Question <i>re</i> Statutory Welfare Board for —		678
Balakrishnan, Sri V.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952		702
Condolence resolution <i>re</i> death of Sri Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur.		446
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		
Bapanayya, Sri G.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952		716, 731 928-929
Bapu Naidu, Sri P.—		
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.		
Basic Training School, Pallipad—		
<i>See</i> Schools.		
Beedi workers—		
Question <i>re</i> awards of Industrial Tribunals <i>re</i> —		450-452
Beypore Port.		
<i>See</i> Ports.		
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952—		
<i>See</i> Bills.		
Bills—		
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		424-428
Message from the Council <i>re</i> —		472
Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		419-420
Message from the Council <i>re</i> —		472
Cotton Control Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		420-424
Message from the Council <i>re</i> —		472
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		250-274 405-419
Message from the Council <i>re</i> —		472
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		473-486
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, question <i>re</i> dropping of —		447-448
Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952 —		1079-1083
Considered and passed into law		
Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952—		
Message from the Governor <i>re</i> —		31
Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		439-440
Message from the Council <i>re</i> —		472
Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		441
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		488-500
Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952—		
Considered and passed into law		486-487
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952—		
Message from the Governor <i>re</i> —		31
Referred to Joint Select Committee		148-175 204-235, 236-249
Message from the Council <i>re</i>		472
Considered and passed into law		558-621
		692-761, 796-863, 899-974, 1014-1079
Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory—		
Question <i>re</i> shifting of — from Kodur to Madras		1003-1005
Birth control clinics—		
Question <i>re</i> number, location, etc., of — in the State		26

B—cont.

Bridge

Question re—

Construction of a — across Cherupuzhathodu (North Malabar) .. 890

Construction of a — across the Godavari at Alamuru .. 290

Construction of a — across Kanayangode Ferry (North Malabar). 456

Construction of a — across Venkajeru river .. 545

British Governors' portraits—

Question re removal of — from Rajaji Hall .. 679

Bukkapatnam tank—

See "Tanks."

Bus Transport—

See Transport.

Business of the House—

Change in the order of — .. 439, 441

Change of non-official day into official day (rule 24) .. 690-691

Programme of — .. 235-236

898

Calendering machine—

See Handloom Industry.

Calingapatnam Port—

See Ports.

Cancer—

See Hospitals.

Capital punishment—

Question re award of — in Pudukottai before and after merger .. 106

Cars—

See Transport.

Cattle-breeding co-operative Societies—

Question re — in Cuddapah district .. 180-182

Cement factory—

Question re opening of a — at Pudukkottai .. 389

Chadayan, Sri M.—

Resolution re — Handloom Industry .. 70-71

Chandra Chudamani Deo, Sri Vyricherla—

Sworn in .. 653

Cherupuzhathodu Bridge—

See Bridge.

Chidanandam, Sri V.—

Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery .. 337

Chookalingam, Sri P.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. 1063-1065

Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952—

See Bills.

Cinchona Plantations —

Question re retrenchment in Government — in Anamalais .. 192-193

Civil Supplies Department—

See Food.

Coconut Research Station—

Question re opening of a — at Chowghat .. 200

College(s)—

Question re—

Arts College, Cuddapah—Dramatic performances for collecting .. 679

funds for hostel.

Law College, Provision of hostel for students of— .. 517-519

Schools and — details re— .. 464

	C—cont.	PAGES
Committee—		
Question re—		
Constituted under G.O. No. 2483, Education, dated 28th September 1948		24
Report of the—on the separation of Judiciary from Executive		94-95
Communal disturbances—		
Question re—in connexion with cow-slaughter at Payyoli		387-388
Communist prisoners—		
Question re—		
In Salem—Jail, transfer to jails in their own linguistic areas		765
Weekly searches of — in jails		96-98
Community Projects—		
Question re—in the State, details re—		8-12
Condolence resolution re—		534-535
Death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur (Raja of Karvetnagar)		445-447
Constitution of India—		
Question re—making of rules under article 166 (3) of the —		179-180
Contour Bunding Scheme—		
Question re—continuance of — in Vayalpad taluk		984
Co-operative central bank (s)—		
Question re—		
Management of the Masulipatnam —		298-299
Security deposit of employees of —		896
Supersession of the Srikakulam—		994-996
Co-operative department—		
Question re—		
Employees of —, prohibition from membership of co-operative societies		990-991
Strength of gazetted officers in — community war		985-986
Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank, Pudukkottai—		
Question re date of starting of —		1002
Co-operative societies—		
Question re—		
Cattle breeding — in Cuddapah district		180-182
Field labour — in Krishna district		669-670
Indian Evacuees and Dependents' Spinning and Weaving Co-operative Society, Yellaman hill, representation re maladministration of —		95
Khadi production and sale by —		282
Land colonization —, Ganapavaram		301-302
Motor Transport— for ex-servicemen at Cuddapah, organization of a		782
Prohibition of co-operative department employees from membership of —		990-991
Weavers —, adoption of a model by-law for appointment of clerks in		200
Co-operative union—		
Question re State Co-operative Union, annual grants made to		101-102
Cottage Industries Loans and Subsidy Rules, 1948—		
See Papers laid on the table of the House.		
Cotton Control Bill, 1952—		
See Bills.		
Court—		
Question re—		
Munsif's Court at Payanoor, opening of a		675
Sub-Magistrate's Court in Punganur, location of		660-661
Cow-slaughter—		
Question re Communal disturbances at Payyoli (North Malabar) in connexion with —		387-388

C—cont.

Craft Instruction— <i>See</i> Schools.	
Crops— Question <i>re</i> failure of — in Malabar	997
Culinary essences— <i>See</i> Prohibition.	
Cyclone— Adjournment motion <i>re</i> havoc caused by — in Tanjore and Tiruchi- rappalli districts	1011-1013
Dams— <i>See</i> Irrigation works.	
Dearness allowance— <i>See</i> Pensioners' Association, Cannanore. <i>See</i> Pudukkottai State Devasthanam Department.	
Dedda Hall Anicut— Question <i>re</i> execution of—	787
D	
Deivasigamany, Sri S. — Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	849 66-67
Depressed classes— Question <i>re</i> lands reserved for — in Nellore district, alleged cultiva- tion by caste ryots	680-681
Deputy Collectors— Question <i>re</i> abolition of direct recruitment of —	103
Devasthanam department— Question <i>re</i> Pudukkottai State — employees, grant of dearness allowance to	675
Development board— Question <i>re</i> constitution of a — for Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts	523-524
Dharmalingam, Sri M. — Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	342-344
Dispensaries— Question <i>re</i> — Financial aid to — in panchayats Local fund dispensary at Hosdrug, conversion into a Govern- ment hospital Opening of a dispensary in Obilivaripalli, Rajampet taluk ..	404 516-517 199
Disqualification of a Member— High Court's judgment <i>re</i> the disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao	29-30 107-108
District and Sessions Judge— <i>See</i> Judiciary.	
District Board, Guntur— Question <i>re</i> Government's remarks on administration of — ..	12-13
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952— <i>See</i> Bills.	
Drainage Scheme— Question <i>re</i> estimated cost of Tenali —	5-6
Drama— Question <i>re</i> ban on Telugu plays "Mabhoomi" and "Mundadugu".	90-93

E

Educational concessions—

See Adjournment motions; Government servants; School fee concessions.

Elections—

Question re—

—to Udamalpet Municipality, Reservation of seat for scheduled castes. 890

Election duties, delay in payment of travelling allowance to teachers in Waltuvanad f r 538

Holding of — to panchayat boards in South Kanara district .. 14-16

Holding of — to panchayat boards under the Village Panchayats Act, 1950 .. 539

Major and minor panchayats, mode of election to .. 16-17

Municipal —, prevention of corrupt practices in .. 548

Municipal —, use of indelible ink in .. 887-888

Return of election expenses, expenditure incurred by the Government for action taken in cases of failure to lodge .. 549-550

Elections (Corporation and Municipal)—

See Papers laid on the table of the House.

Electoral rolls—

Question re revision of — in 1952-53; allocation of expenditure between Government and local bodies .. 550-551

Electricity—

Question re—

Extension of — to Ottapalam, Malabar .. 537

Extension of — to villages around Hindupur from Hindupur .. 536

Supply Station .. 465

Hydro-electric sites, investigation of .. 528-530

Machkund Hydro-Electric Project, details re .. 537

Supply of — to Bapatla Municipality .. 786

Supply of — to Hosur taluk .. 882

Supply of — to Jaggaippet .. 883-884

Supply of — to Nandigama taluk .. 286-288,

Supply of Jog electric power to South Kanara and Rayalaseema .. 471-472

Survey for construction of a thermal station at Kadiri .. 201

Thermal station at Nellore—Information re power generation, supply, etc .. 466-467

987-988

Undertaking of distribution work by local bodies .. 515-516

Employment Exchange—

Question re number of unemployed registered in .. 895

Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers)

Amendment Bill, 1952—

See Bills.

Estates—

Question re—

Munagala Estate, enquiry into the dispute between the zamindar and tenants .. 182-184

Vizianagaram Estate, application of Rent Reduction Act to under-tenure estates, etc., in the .. 292-293

Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948—

Amendment and rule under section 40 (1) of the — .. 436-439

Question re—

Estates taken over under the — district war figures re .. 467

186-187

Government's claim to the Kanur lanka lands in Kovvur taluk under the .. 996-997

Inam villages which are not estates .. 467-468

A—cont.

Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill—
See Bills.

Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Second Amendment Act—

Question re commutations rate of rent fixed under the	452
Evacuees from Burma, etc.—	
Question re recovery of loans advanced to —	676

F

Famine—

Adjournment motion re —	
—in Kakinada taluk	792
—in Malabar	792
—in Nellore	791-792
—and food policy of the Government	792-793
Starvation death in Guntur district	791
Question re—	
—Condition in Pattukottai taluk	897
Gruel centres in Rayalaseema, substitution of sangati for gruel in—	468
Nutritive value of gruel supplied in gruel centres	196-197
Opening of gruel centres in South Arcot district	675
Relief works in Palnad taluk	983-984
Relief works in Visakhapatnam district	879-881
Subsistence loans in Madanapalle, number of applications for	888

See Food ; Roads.

Fernandez, Sri W. J.—

Bills — Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1932	440
Resolution re Handloom Industry	129-130

Ferry Service—

Question re collection of excess fares by ferry contractors in Malabar	22
--	----

Field labour co-operative societies—

See Lands.

Filariasis—

Question re prevention of — in Kasargod, Cannanore and Baliapatam towns	12, 780-781
---	-------------

Fire station—

Question re opening of a — at Ongole and Rajampet	402-404
---	---------

Firka Development Committee—

See Rural Welfare Committees.

Fishermen—

Question re grant of interest-free loans to — towards share capital for forming co-operative societies	298-289
--	---------

Fishing tanks—

Question re number of — in Livestock Research Station, Hosur	106
--	-----

Five-Year Plan—

Question re memorandum submitted by Government to Prime Minister of India re —	659-661
--	---------

Food—

Question re—

Civil Supplies staff retrenched consequent on decontrol of	874-878
Fair price shops for Government servants in Masulipatnam town	463
Fair price shops in Krishna district, number and off take after decontrol	458
Fair price shops, procedure for appointment of dealers for	871-872
Price of rice in Tanjore district, checking the up-ward trend in	23
Rationing Officer, Malabar district, allegations against	870
Rice content of ration in Upland and Dltta areas	198-199
Rice export from Krishna district, prevention of	2-5
Rice export from Visakhapatnam district, prevention of	779-780

See Paddy.

F—cont.

Food situation in the State—	
Debate on — requested	107, 236 557-568
Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order—	
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> —	899
Foodgrains Movement Control Order—	
Question <i>re</i> prosecution under—	5
Question <i>re</i>	
Forest blocks—	
Question <i>re</i> auctioning — in Pudukkottai division for green, manure purposes	668
Forest officials—	
Question <i>re</i> —	
Complaint against—in Cuddapah district	998-1000
Forestguards and watchers, increase of salary of	897
Pudukkottai — absorption in Madras Forest service	894-895
Foresters—	
Question <i>re</i> instructions for transfer of —	107
Forests—	
Question <i>re</i> —	
Administration of zamindari —	988-989
Coups leased out in Cuddapah South Forest Division, particulars <i>re</i>	394
Disafforestation of 800 acres in Kothapalem Reserve Forest, application for	198
Permission for goat-browsing in zamindari—	389-391
Rights of people in zamindari — press note on	789
Fuel depot—	
Question <i>re</i> Government — at Pudukkottai, closure of	535-536

G

Gajapathi Raju, Sri P. V. R.—	
Condolence resolution <i>re</i> death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur	446
Gajulapalli tank—	
<i>See</i> Tanks.	
Ganapavaram Land Colonization Society—	
Question <i>re</i> organisation and working of—	301-302
Glass beads training centres—	
Question <i>re</i> particulars of—	1002- 1003
Godavari bridge—	
<i>See</i> Bridges.	
Gopala Menon, Sri N.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	929-930
Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	339-360
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.	
Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri Vavilala—	
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast for the formation of Andhra State	556
Bills—	
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952	425-428
Cotton Control Bill, 1952	422
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1953	251-253, 419
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Bill, 1952	474-475 479-480, 481, 482, 483, 486

G—cont.

Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri Vavilala—cont.

Bills—cont.

Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	498-499
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	229-232
244 2 6, 712-713, 726, 727-730	
732-733, 739-740, 751-752, 757-	
759, 822-823, 826-827, 912, 928	
955, 971, 1023, 1039-1041	

Motion re—

Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1918, amendment and rule under	437-438
--	---------

Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, amendment of Schedule II to—

433

Resolution re—

Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	307
Hanloom Industry	39-43

See Questions and Answers.

Gopalakrishnan, Sri P. K.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	815-817
---	---------

927-928

Resolution re Hanloom Industry	77-79
--	-------

See Questions and Answers.

Gopalan, Sri K. P.—

Adjournment motion re retrenchment of workers in Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar	552-553
--	---------

554

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	742-744
---	---------

747, 749-750, 837-838, 921

Resolution re Handloom Industry	38, 65-66
---	-----------

See Questions and Answers.

Gopalan Unni, Sri K. C.—

See Questions and Answers.

Government Bus Transport.—

See Transport.

Government business—

Question re transaction in regional languages (Tamil)	665-666
---	---------

Government officers—

Question re number drawing Rs. 1,000 and above	187-188
--	---------

Government servants—

Question re—

House-rent allowance for—	99-100
-----------------------------------	--------

180

House rent allowance for—in Hosdrug, grant of	
Non-gazetted officers, educational concessions granted to the children of	524-525

Non-gazetted officers in the Revenue Department in Malabar, non-confirmation of	100-101
---	---------

684

Number of — appointed under emergency provisions	
Remarks in confidential files of—Communication to the person concerned	304

Ventilation of grievances of—through Legislators	83-87
--	-------

Government Servants Conduct Rules—

Question re Government Servants, association with friends of the Soviet Union and with Peace Committees	1
---	---

Govinda Rao, Sri K.—

Bills—Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	488-489
--	---------

499

Resolution re—Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	360-362
--	---------

See Questions and Answers.

G—cont.

PAGES

Govindaswami Nayagar, Sri A—	
Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	262-265
Resolution re Handloom Industry	112-114
See Questions and Answers.	
Grama sevaks—	
Question re qualifications prescribed for—	683-684
Grazing lands—	
Adjournment motion re collection of rents for—in Kanigiri taluk	791
Groundnut—	
Question re inclusion of — within the scope of the Guntur Tobacco Market Committee	294-295
Groundnut Market Committee—	
Question re constitution of a—for North Arcot and Salem districts.	448-450
Gruel Centres.	
See Famine.	
Habitual offenders settlements —	
Question re particulars re —	543-544
Handloom industry—	
Question re—	
Installation of calendering machine in Rayalaseema	90
Number of handlooms in South Arcot, Chittoor, etc., districts	788
Resolution re—	32-813
	108-148
Handloom weavers—	
Question re exemption of — from payment of house or property tax levied by local bodies	881-882
Hanumantha Rao, Sri M.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	723-724
	814, 1065-1066
Resolution re Handloom Industry	120-122
See Questions and Answers.	
Harijan Hostel —	
Question re—	
Masulipatnam, number of boarders etc	894
Harijans—	
Question re—	
Grant of Agricultural loans to—and Harijan Christians	1006
Harijan Inspectors of Police promoted as Deputy Superintendents of Police in 1951-52, number of	551
Promotion of — to the Tahsildars' grade	773-774
Weavers' co-operative societies, exclusively formed, for —	104
Harijan Welfare Department.	
Question re —	
Communities eligible for help by the—	301-302
District Welfare Officers, supply of jeeps to	546
High Court—	
Question re—criminal appeals pending in the— on 1st April 1952	
number of	471
Homolopath.	
Question re registration of—under the Medical Registration Act, representation re	531
Hospital (s)—	
Question re—	
Cancer hospital at Madras, allotment of site for	870-871
Government Headquarters—in Mangalore, facilities for tuberculosis patients	532-533
Government—in Munagala, working of	95-96

H—cont.

Hospital(s)—cont.	
Question re—	
Government — in Nandigama, extension of	538
Government — at Nuzvid, improvement of	463
Headquarters Hospital, Badagara, extension of	7-8
Labour cases treated in Government—during 1949-52, number of ..	29
Malaria cases treated in Government — in 1948-52, number of ..	891
Pudukkottai General Hospital and Ranees Hospital, augmenting the bed strength of	777-778
See Dispensaries.	
House rent allowance—	
Question re—	
—sanctioned for Government servants	99-100, 180
—to menials of Tenali Municipality	23-24
House tax—	
Question re levy of — by panchayat boards	1001-1032
Housing Scheme—	
Question re progress of — at Madanapalle	1000-1001
Hydrogenation Factory, Kozhikode—	
Question re management of —	785
I	
Inam villages—	
See Estates (Abolition, etc.) Act.	
Indian Civil Service Officer—	
Adjournment Motion re allegations of corruption against* ..	1010-1011
Indian Evacuees and Dependents Spinning and Weaving Co-operative Society.	
See Co-operative Societies.	
Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952—	
See Bills.	
Industrial dispute—	
Question re Parli Kumar Industries, Palghat, memorandum re ..	674
See Shri Shaib Industrial and Spiritual Colony Charities.	
Industrial Investment Corporation, Limited—	
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Internal security measures—	
Question re expenditure on — during 1950-53, details re. ..	26-28
Irrigation works—	
Question re—	
Amount spent on — in Atmakur taluk	788-789
Execution of new — in Pudukkottai Division	525-526
Rayavaram, Modukuru and Jampapalam dams, investigation of ..	872-873
J	
Jails—	
Question re—	
Diet supplied in —, nutritive value of	105
Weekly searches of Communist prisoners in —	96-98
Jayarama Reddiyar, Sri S.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	604
Jeevanandam, Sri P.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	1066-1068
Resolution re Handloom Industry	39, 59-62
Janmi pattadars—	
Question re — in Malabar, details re	26

	J—cont.	PAGES
Jog Falls—		
Question re power supply from — to Rayalaseema and South Kanara		286-288
Judiciary—		471-472
Question re—		
District and Sessions Judge appointed by direct recruitment recently		526-527
Report of the Committee on the Separation of the — from the Executive		94-95
Reservation of posts for Revenue staff in the Scheme of Separation of — from the Executive		450
	K	
Kalyanasundaram, Sri M.—		
Resolution re Handloom Industry		39
See Questions and Answers.		126-128
Kanaran, Sri C. H.—		
Resolution re Handloom Industry		79-80
Kanayangode Ferry—		
See Bridges.		
Kandaswami, Sri C.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952		211-217
856-857, 861-862, 904-905, 924-925, 1052-1054		
Nominated to the Panel of Chairmen		30
See Questions and Answers.		
Kanupur Scheme—		
Question re details regarding —		291-292
Karuthiruman, Sri P. G.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952		562-565
		695
Kasturidevi Girls' High School—		
See Schools.		
Kattalai High Level Canal—		
Question re —		990-991
Khadi—		
Question re production and sale of — by co-operative societies		282
Khosla Committee Report—		
Question re—		653-657
Kolkebil, Sri S. S.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952		730-731
Kondayya, Sri G. C.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952		208-209
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.		307-315
See Questions and Answers.		
Kosalram, Sri K. T.—		
See Questions and Answers.		
Kotaiah, Sri Pragada—		
Resolution re—		
Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery		307
		352-353, 376
Handloom Industry		114-119
		147
See Questions and Answers.		
Kotamma Reddi, Srimathi Thamma—		
Nominated to the Panel of Chairmen		30
Krishna Anicut—		
Question re damages to —		885-886

K—cont.

Krishna Anicut Enquiry Committee Report—	
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Krishna Ayyar, Sri V. R.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	801-803
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	315-321
Krishna Motor Workers' Union—	
Question re representation from the — re violation of the Motor ..	
Vehicles Act by bus owners	774-775
Krishnamurthy Rao, Sri B.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Krishnamurthy Gounder, Sri D.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Krishnan, Sri R.—	
Bills—	
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	2620
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1062-1063
See Questions and Answers.	
Krishna Rao, Sri K.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Krishna Rao, Sri Y. V.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	700-701
	796-797
	939-941
Krishna Rao, the Hon. Dr. M. V.—	
Adjournment motion re students' strikes in Andhradesa ..	
against detention system in high schools	795
Krishna Rao, The Hon. Dr. U.—	
Adjournment motion re retrenchment of workers in Raja ..	
Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar	553, 554
Motion re Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931—amendment ..	
of Schedule II to the	429-431
	433-435
Resolution re Handloom Industry	32-37
Krishnaswami Ayyangar, Sri P. S.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	703, 803-
	804, 840-
	841, 1027
Kumar Industries, Palghat—	
Question re—	
Industrial dispute in —memorandum re	674
State aid granted to —	455-456
Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur, Sri—	
Leave of absence to —	31
Condolence resolution re death of —	445-447
Kune Rao, Sri M.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	826, 840
Kunhi Muhammad Shafee, Janab—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Kunhirama Kurup, Sri C.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Kuttikrishnan Nair, the Hon. Sri K. P.—	
Bills—	
Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952	419-420
Madras Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952	441

Labour Unions—	
Question <i>re</i> —municipal workers' —, refusal of recognition in certain cases	400-401
Lakshmana Das, Sri L.—	
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.	
Lakshmanaswami, Sri M.—	
Bills—	
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment), Bill, 1952	49i-492
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	754-755
Lakshmayya, Sri D.—	
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.	
Lakshminarasa Raju, Sri B.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1071-1072
Lakshminarayana Reddi, Sri T.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	753, 841—
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	842
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.	57-59
Land(s)—	
Adjournment Motion <i>re</i> assignment of—to landless labourers	791-792
Question <i>re</i> —	
Assignment of, to landless poor	676, 992—
.. .. .	994
Assignment of, to political sufferers	193-195
.. .. .	284-285
.. .. .	291, 878—
.. .. .	879, 1006
Darimila inam —, katubandi, collection from	778-779
Dispossession of Aborigines of — in Wynaad	296
Encroachment on Government — by Dondapadu village ryots	766-768
Eviction from — of some villagers of Kottur	296-298
Illegal alienation of — by zamindars	783-784
Kanur Lanka in West Godavari, Government's claim to—	
under the Estates Abolition Act	996-997
Lanka—leased out to field labour co-operative societies, Krishna district	669-670
Pattas for — applied for and granted in West Godavari district, number of	682
Poramboke — brought under cultivation in Gingee taluk in 1951-52	98-99
—reserved for depressed classes in Nellore district, alleged cultivation by caste ryots	680-681
Waste — in Kajikalur taluk, extent of	893
Waste —etc. —in Kasargode taluk, extent of	468
Land colonization co-operative societies—	
<i>See</i> Co-operative Societies.	
Land mortgage bank.—	
<i>See</i> Co-operative Land Mortgage Bank.	
Land revenue—	
Question <i>re</i> —	
Dry and wet assessment in Malabar	464-465
Remission of — in Pedabilli village, Penukonda taluk	889
Landless poor—	
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> eviction of landless poor in Musaneli village in Tanjore district	685-687
Latchanna, Sri G.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	157, 160—
.. .. .	162, 578—
.. .. .	580
Translation of Proceedings of the Assembly	203
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.	

L—cont.

Law College, Madras—
See Colleges.

Leave of absence to member—

Motion *re* — Sri Kumaraswamy Raja Bahadur 31

Legislative Assembly—

Translation of the Proceedings of— 203-204
305-306

Legislative Assembly staff—

Question *re* overtime allowances paid to — during Budget Session
(June-July 1952) 668-669

Legislators' Hostel—

Question *re* thefts in the— 661-662

Libraries—

Question *re* purchase of books on Soviet Union and China, Circular
of the Director of Public Instruction *re* 19-20

See Andhra Desa Libraries Conference.

Library Committees—

Question *re*—

Librarians under District — 671-672
State — action taken on the resolutions of 544

Library Service—

Question *re* scheme for extension of— 278-279

Lignite—

Question *re* mining of — in South Arcot district 452-453

Livestock Research Station, Hosur—

Question *re*—

Cost of maintenance and popularizing the results of experiments
in— 24-26
Number of fishing tanks in— 106

Loans—

Question *re*—

Agricultural — grant of, to Harijans in West Godavari 1006

Interest-free — grant of, to fishermen 288-289

Madras Government's 'Five Crore loan' 786-787

Recovery of — granted to dependants of Indian nationals in
Burma, etc., during the war 676

Takkavi and subsistence — disbursed in Nellore district in 1952 544

M

Machkund Hydro-Electric Project—

See Electricity.

Madanapalle Theosophical High School—

See Schools.

Madras Electricity System (Medical Officer)—

See Papers laid on the table of the House.

Mahamed Salih Maraikayar, Janab—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 232

See Questions and Answers.

Malabar Tenancy Act—

Question *re* fair rent for pepper gardens fixed under the —
reduction of 537
See Papers laid on the table of the House.

Malaria—

Question *re* Anti-Malarial operations in Divi talu, conduct of 286
See Hospitals.

Mampuram Tile and Clay Works, Malabar—

Question *re* look-out in 201-202

M—cont.

Maneru Project—	
Question re investigation of—	784-785
Manganese ore—	
See ' Mines '—	
Maniakavelu Naicker, The Hon. Sri M.A.—	
Bills—	
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952	424,426
	427,428
Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952	486-487
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	148-149
233-234, 249, 558, 561, 617-621, 705-706, 710	
714, 721, 724, 730, 732, 742, 747, 750, 759, 797	
807-809, 812, 814-816, 821, 826, 828, 833, 836	
851-853, 863, 909, 911, 912, 914-916, 933, 937	
941-943, 946-947, 966, 970, 971, 1020, 1025, 1027	
1035-1038.	
Motion re Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, 1948, amendment and rule under	436-438
Manjaya Shetty, Sri Y.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	206-208
Market Committee—	
See Groundnut Market committee.	
Maternity and child welfare centres—	
Question re number of — in the furnished areas of the State in 1952	469
Medical officers—	
Question re—	
Particulars regarding — deputed to Hyderabad State	304
Pudukkottai State — absorption into Madras Medical Service	469-470
Medical Practitioners—	
Question re of Indigenous Medicine in rural dispensaries, grant of subsidy to—	550
Menon, Dr. K. B.—	
Adjournment motion re eviction of landless poor in Musaveli village in Tanjore district	685-686
Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	247-248
	1019-1020
Resolution re Handloom Industry	124-125
Message from the Council re—	
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952	472
Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952	472
Cotton Control Bill, 1952	472
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	472
Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952	472
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	472
Message from the Governor re—	
Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952	31
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	31
Mid Pennar Project—	
Question re — investigation of	890
Milk—	
Question re supply of free — to expectant mothers, etc., through maternity and child welfare centres	466
Milo—	
Question re nutritive value of — supplied in gruel centres	196-197
Mines—	
Question re manganese ore in Nellore district, mining of—	893

M—cont.

Minimum wages— See Agricultural labourers.	
Ministers—	
Question re—	
Pay and allowances of—	467
Tour of— in Srikakulam district where a by-election was pending	865-869
Tour programmes of—	673-674
Mogral, Janab M. S.—	
Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	580-581
See Questions and Answers.	
Mohamed Shafee, Janab K. K.—	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	56-57
Mohan Industries Limited., Tenali—	
Question re grant of State aid to—	392-394
Moidu, Janab K.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Motor Transport Society—	
See Transport.	
Motor Vehicles Act, 1939—	
Question re violation of the — by bus owners, representation re	774-775
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931.—	
Amendment of Schedule II to the	429-436
Question re exemption of mobile motion picture vehicles of American — Consulate from taxation under—	201
Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952—	
See Bills.	
Muni Reddi, Sri M.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Municipal administration—	
Question re reorganization of—	1006
Municipal workers—	
Question re labour unions of — refusal of recognition in certain cases.	400-401
Municipalities—	
See Elections.	
Munsif's Court, Payyanoor—	
See Court.	
Muslim prayers—	
Adjournment of the House on Fridays for	405
Muthiah Chettiar of Chettinad, Raja—	
Bills—	
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	272-274
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	951-952
	1033-1034, 1038-1039
Muthiah Pillai, Sri C.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	209-211
Muthu Sri V.—	
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	334-337
Muthukumaraswami, Sri—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	241-244

Nagabhushanam, Sri G.—	
Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	253-255
Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	355-357
Nagan Gouda, the Hon. Dr. R.—	
Bills—	
Cotton Control Bill, 1952	420-422 424
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	488, 500
Nagarajan, Sri V. R.—	
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	123-124
See Questions and Answers.	
Nagi Reddi, Sri T.—	
Bills—	
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	410-412
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	712, 725 729, 818, 842-843, 955-956, 1029, 1032-1033
Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	326-331
Nallasivam, Sri K. R.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	227-229
Nallaswami, Sri B. K.—	
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	53-55
Narasaraopet Company Electrical Undertaking—	
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Narasimha Raju, Sri Appala—	
Question <i>re</i> recovery of loan granted under Well Subsidy Scheme to—	396-397
Narasimha Reddi, Sri P.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayana Kurup, Sri M.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	162-164 721-723
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayana Nambiar, Sri M.—	
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayanan Nambiar, Sri T. C.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	714, 1070-1071
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	37-38 44-45
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayanappa, Sri S.—	
Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	67-68
See Questions and Answers.	
Narayanaswami Naidu, Sri G.—	
Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	217-227 701-702, 1068-1070
Narayanaswamy, Sri M.—	
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	691
Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	598-601 824-825
See Questions and Answers.	
Neeladri Rao Reddi, Sri Asi—	
Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	358
Nellore district—	
Question <i>re</i> bifurcation of — proposals for	892

N—cont.

Nellore District Inferior Servants' Association—

See Service Associations.

New Deal for Tanjore Ryots' Pamphlet—

See Papers laid on the table of the House.

Nippatipadu tank—

See Tanks.

Non-gazetted officers—

See Government servants.

Non-Gazetted Officers' Association—

See Service Associations.

Nurses—

Question *re* deputation of — for training in the United Kingdom,
particulars *re* 29

P

Paddy—

Adjournment Motion *re* price of varam paddy 792Question *re*—

Machines for thrashing—manufacture of 549

Particulars of price of — paid to janmis in Malabar 989-990

Procurement price of —delay in payment of 777

Padmaprabha Gounder, Sri M. K.—

See Questions and Answers.

Pais, Sri L. C.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 164-167

Palaniandi, Sri M.—

Adjournment motion *re* — cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirapalli districts 1011-1013

Palaniswami Gounder, Sri V. K.—

Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 412-413

Palaniswami Gounder, the Hon. Sri V. C.—

Bill—Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952 439-440

Panchaksharam, Sri S.—

Resolution *re* Handloom Industry 125-126

Panchayat Act—

K. Question *re* changes in — suggestions by Cabinet Sub-Committee *re* 6-7

Panchayat Board, Phirangipuram—

Question *re* removal of president of 1007

Panchayat Board, Yellamanchili—

Question *re* supersession of — 87-90

Panchayat boards—

Adjournment motion *re* elections to minor — by show of hands 687-690Question *re*—

Elections to — in South Kanara district, holding of 14-16

Elections to major and minor — 16-17,

539

Levy of house tax by — 1001-1002

List of trained executive officers for — maintenance of 202-203

Panel of Chairmen—

Announcement *re* — 30

Paper—

Question *re* — used in Government Offices, whether Indian or foreign 666-667

Papers laid on the table of the House—

Cottage Industries Loans and Subsidy Rules, 1948—Amendment to G.O. No. 2408, dated 10th October 1952)	17
Elections to Corporation Council, notice for fresh elections to seven divisional seats (G.O. No. 1720, dated 26th August 1952)	82
Elections to Municipal Council, (Coimbatore), seats reserved for Anglo-Indians (G.O. No. 1964, dated 6th October 1952)	82
Elections to Municipal Councils, stopping of elections for seats reserved for Anglo-Indians (G.O. No. 1752, dated 30th August 1952 and No. 1993, dated 9th October 1952)	82
Krishna Aicut Enquiry Committee Report	761
Madras Industrial Investment Corporation, Limited, balance sheet as at 30th June 1952	500
Malabar Tenancy Act, 1929, amendment to rules under	81
Medical Officer, Madras Electricity System, exclusion of post from the purview of the Public Service Commission (G.O. No. 2408, dated 10th October 1952)	175
Motor Vehicles Act, 1939, amendments to rules under	81
Narasaraopet Company Electrical Undertaking, acquisition and absorption of staff in Government service (G.O. No. 3602, dated 27th August 1952)	500
'New Deal for Tanjore Ryots' Pamphlet	500
Salem Jail Shooting incident, Report of the Committee on	81
Special Armed Police Units in West Godavari district, answers to starred questions	81
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952, Report of the Select Committee on	82
Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923, amendments to rules under	81
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Ordinance and amending Ordinances, 1952	82
Pavoli (North Malabar)—	
Question re communal disturbances in connexion with cow slaughter in	387-388
Peace Committees—	
See Government Servants' Conduct Rules.	
Pension—	
Question re counting of officiating service and pay for	682-683
Pensioners, removal of the cut in dearness allowance and other reliefs for	662-664
Pepper gardens—	
Question re fair rent for—fixed under the Malabar Tenancy Act, reduction of	537
Pincha project—	
Question re investigation of—In Cuddapah district	469
Planning Commission—	
Question re Report of the Technical Committee of—(Khosla Committee)	653-657
Police—	
Question re—	
Allegations against the Karula	785-786
Constables, Supply of boots to	891-892
Konduri Satyanarayana's death while in Police custody	459-461
Sub-Inspectors and Deputy Superintendents of—Directly recruited between 1st April 1937 and 31st March 1951, number of	548
Sub-Inspectors of Police, direct recruitment of	279-280
Police camps—	
Question re—Number and work of Armed	462
Political sufferers—	
See Lands.	
Polytechnics—	
Question re construction of buildings for	546-547
Poramboke lands—	
Question re—Fines collected for cultivation of—during 1951-52 in Gingee taluk	98-99

P—cont.

Ports—	
Question re—	
Development of Beypore Port	197-198
Improvement of Calingapatnam Port	447
Special Officer's report on the improvement of minor —	293
Poultry farms—	
Question re particulars re — in the State	546
Preventive Detention Act—	
Question re implementation of —	397-399
Privilege motion re incorrectness of an answer to a question	763-764
Procurement bonus—	
Question re—Payment of—in certain villages of Bapatla taluk	775-776
Prohibition—	
Question re—	
Ameliorative measures for ex-toddy tappers	302-304
Culinary essences, sale at blackmarket prices of	399
Number of vans supplied to the Deputy Prohibition Officer, Villupuram	283
Prohibition (Amendment) Bill, 1952—	
See Bills.	
Prohibition department—	
Question re clerks in — promotion of	896
Public Administration.	
See Administrative machinery.—	
Public Prosecutors.	
Question re—Pay and daily fees of—representation re	682
Public Service Commission, Madras —	
Question re —	
Refund of fees to rejected applicants and selections in 1950	282-283
1952.	897
Viva voce examinations by the —, stenographic recording of	682
Pudukkottai—	
Question re—	
Devasthanam employees of — grant of dearness allowance to	675
Forest officials of — absorption in Madras Forest Service of	894-895
Medical officers of — absorption in Madras Medical Service of	469-470
Irrigation schemes in—execution of	525-526
Pudukkottai General Hospital and Rance's Hospital, augmenting the bed strength of.	777-778
Pulla Reddi, Sri C.—	
Bill—	
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	255-257
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1061-1062
Pumpsets—	
Question re—American 'Hallet', purchase of	1000
Pundarikakshacharyulu, Sri P.—	
Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	750, 801
817-818	
822, 902	
1018-1019	

Q

Questions and Answers —

Anantha Pai, Sri T.—

Question re—

Electricity supply of Jog power to South Kanara	471-472
Municipal elections, prevention of corrupt practices in	548

Appa Rao, Sri M. R.—

Question re—Government Hospital at Nuzvid, improvement of	463
---	-----

Questions and Answers—cont.

Appu, Sri A.—	
Question re—	
Bus fares in Kozhikode—Kakkodi route, revision of	672-673
Hindu temples in Malabar, appointment of Non-caste Hindus as executive officers of	451
Aranganathan Sri K.—	
Question re—	
Deputy Collectors, Tahsildars and Deputy Tahsildars who were reverted on 15th August 1952	29
Groun nut Market Committee for North Arcot and Salem Districts, constitution of—	448-450
Poramboke lands, fines collected in 1951-52 in Gingee taluk for cultivation of	98-99
Separation of judiciary from the executive, reservation of posts for Revenue staff in the scheme of	450
Vans supplied to the Deputy Prohibition Officer, Villupuram, number of	283
Arumugam, Sri R. S.—	
Question re Sub-Inspectors and Deputy Superintendents of Police directly recruited between 1st April 1937 and 31st March, 1952 number of	548
Arunachalam, Sri A. J.—	
Question re handloom weavers, exemption from payment of house or property tax levied by local bodies of	881-882
Audinarayana Reddi, Sri Y.—	
Question re Pincha project (Cuddapah district), investigation of	469
Babu Naidu, Sri P.—	
Question re—	
Rayapuram, Modukuru and Jampapalam dams—Investigation of	872-873
Yellamanchili Panchayat Board, supersession of	87-90
Balakrishnan, Sri V.—	
Question re—	
Agricultural farm in Pudukkottai Division, particulars re	1007
Cancer hospital at Madras, allotment of site for	870-871
Capital punishment, award of—in Pudukkottai before and after merger	106
Cement factory at Pudukkottai, opening of	389
Forest blocks in Pudukkottai division, auctioning for green manure purposes	668
Government fuel depot at Pudukkottai, closure of	535-536
Land Mortgage Bank for Pudukkottai division, date of starting of	1002
Medical officers of Pudukkottai State, absorption into Madras Medical Service	469-470
New irrigation schemes in Pudukkottai Division, execution of—	525-526
Pudukkottai Forest staff—Absorption in Madras Forest Service,	894-895
Pudukkottai General Hospital and Rance's hospital, bed strength of	777-778
Pudukkottai State Devasthanam Department, grant of dearness allowance to employees of	675
Ranalingam Chettiar Retrenchment Committee recommendations, implementation of	765-766
South Madras Electric Corporation, financial help to	889
Tuberculosis Fund of Pudukkottai State, disposal of	882
Chandra Ramalingiah, Sri—	
Question re—	
Anti-malarial operations in Divi taluk, conduct of	286
Bus permitted to run a second trip each day, number of	7
Motor Vehicles Act, representation re violation of section 65 of, by bus-owners.	774-775

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Dasaratharamiah, Sri D.—	
Question re Thermal station, Nellore, particulars re	987-988
Gopala Menon, Sri N.	
Question re Communal disturbance at Payyoli (North Malabar) in connexion with Cow slaughter	387-388
Gopalakrishnaiah, Sri Vavilala—	
Question re—	
Puirangipuram Panchayat Board President, removal of ..	1007
Planning Commission, Report of the Technical Committee (Khosla Committee) on	655-657
Gopalakrishnan, Sri P. K.—	
Question re drinking water-supply to Cochin	870
Gopalan, Sri K. P.—	
Question re—	
Bridge over Chorupuzhu thodu, construction of	890
Communist political prisoner in Salem Jail, transfer to their linguistic districts of	765
Employment Exchange number of unemployed registered by ..	895
Filaria-ias, control in North Malabar of—	780-781
House tax, levy by panchayat boards of	1001-1002
Hydrogenation factory in Kozhikode, management of	785
Labour unions of municipal workers, refusal of recognition in certain cases	400-401
Munsif's Court at Payyanur, opening of—	675
Paddy price paid to Jemmis in Malabar	989-990
Pensioner's Association, Cannanore, memorial from the — ..	664
Gopalan Unni Sri K. C.—	
Question re—Crop failure in Malabar	997
Govinda Rao, Sri K.—	
Question re—	
Famine relief works in Visakhapatnam district	879-881
Foodgrain export from Visakhapatnam district, Prevention of ..	779-780
Minister's tour in Srikakulam district for election purposes ..	865-869
Rent Reduction, application of — to under-tenure estates and daramla inams in Vizianagaram Estate	292-293
Sarada river (Visakhapatnam district), letting of molasses from the Thummapala Sugar Factory in the	533-534
Secondary Schools, promotion from Lower Grade to Grade I ..	781-782
Telugu Pandits in Well subsidy scheme, recovery of loan granted to Sri Appa & Narasimha Raju	396-397
Hanumantha Rao, Sri M.—	
Question re—	
Assignment to political sufferers of land occupied by the poor, disputes arising out of	284-285
Mohan Industries Limited., Tenali, grant of State aid to ..	392-394
Panchayat boards major and minor, mode of elections to ..	16-17
Preventive Detention Act, implementation of	397-398
Tenancy legislation, enactment of	280-281
Village Panchayat Act, changes suggested by Cabinet Sub-Committee in the	6-7
Water-tax of excess collection from cultivators of turmeric in Krishna Western Delta	104-105
Kalyanasundaram, Sri M.—	
Question re retrenchment as a result of decontrol —	877-878
Kandaswami Sri C.—	
Question re rice, steps taken to check the rise in price in Tanjore district of	23
Kondayya, Sri G. C.—	
Question re irrigation works in Atmakur taluk, expenditure on ..	788-789

Questions and Answers—*cont.*Q—*cont.*

PAGEs

Kosalram, Sri K. T.—

Question re—

Five-crore loan of the Government for financing electricity and irrigation schemes	786-787
Five-year Plan, memorandum re, submitted by Government to Prime Minister of India	653-661

Kotaiiah, Sri Pragada—

Question re—

Interest-free loans to fishermen, grant of	288-289
Khadi production and sale by co-operative societies	182
Weavers' co-operative societies, exemption from levy of audit fees	103
Yarn for making fishing nets, procedure for supply of	461
Yarn, reduction in the price of	462-463

Krishna Rao, Sri K.—

Question re—

Andhra Desa Libraries Conference, implementation of the resolutions of	21-22
Armed Police camps, number and activities of	462
Birth control clinics in the State, number, location, etc. of	26
Central Co-operative Bank employees, Deposit of security of	896
Committee constituted under G.O. No. 2483, Education, dated 28th September 1948	24
Community Project Executive Officers, names, qualifications, etc., of	9-12
Co-operative department employees, prohibition from membership of co-operative societies of	990-991
Co-operative weaver's societies, adoption of a model — by-law for appointment of clerks in	200
Electoral roll revision in 1952-53, allocation of the expenditure between Government and local bodies	540-551
Electric power supply from Jog Falls to Rayalaseema and South Kanara	286-288
Government servants' association with friends of the Soviet Union and with Peace Committees	1
Government servants, Ventilation of grievances through Legislators	83-87
Government servants working under emergency provisions, number of	684
Habitual offenders settlements, particulars re	543-544
Handlooms in South Arcot, Chittoor, etc., districts, number of	788
House rent allowance sanctioned for Government servants	99-100
Hydro-electric sites, investigation of	465
Internal security measures, expenditure on, during 1950-53	26-28
Kanupur scheme, details regarding	291-292
Librarians under District Library Committees	671-672
Libraries, purchase of books from or about Soviet Union and China by	19-20
Library service, scheme for extension of	278-279
Madras Public Service Commission, refund of fees to rejected applicants and selections in 1950-52	282-283, 897
Madras Public Service Commission, stenographic recording of viva voce examinations by	682
Manneru Project, investigation of	784-785
Maternity and child welfare centres, number of, in famished areas of the State in 1952	463
Milk, free supply through maternity and child welfare centres to expectant mothers, etc.	466
Minor Ports, report on the improvement of	293
Pension, counting of officiating service and pay for	682-683
Prohibition Department, promotion of clerks in	896
Rayalaseema, steps taken for the economic development of	539-543

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Krishna Rao, Sri K.—cont.

Question re—

Report of Committee on the Separation of the Judiciary from the Executive	94-95
Rural Welfare Committees, nomination of non-officials to	684
Rural Welfare Officers and Grama Sevaks, qualifications prescribed for	683-684
Ryotwari areas, increase or decrease in the extent of wet areas in	520 523
Service Associations, recognition by Government	456-458
State co-operative unions, annual grants made to	101-102
State Library Committee, action taken on the resolutions of	544
Stores, purchase of, in England	677-678
Thermal station at Nellore, information re power generation, supply, etc. in	466-467
Water rates charged under different irrigation systems	465-466

Krishnamurthy Gounder, Sri D.—

Question re Ministers, pay and allowances of	467
--	-----

Krishnamurthy Rao, Sri B.—

Question re Sub-Magistrate's Court in Punganur, opening of ..	660-661
---	---------

Krishnan, Sri R.—

Question re—

Kumar Industries, Palghat, grant of State aid to	455-456
Kumar Industries, Palghat, memorandum re industrial dispute in	674
Municipal elections, use of indelible ink in	887-888

Kunhi Mohamed Shafee, Janab—

Question re—

Election duties, delay in payment of travelling allowance to teachers in Wailuvnad for	538
Non-gazetted officers in the Revenue department in Malabar, non confirmation of	100-101
Tirurkkad-Anakkayam road (Malabar), bus route, opening of ..	102-103

Kunhirama Kurup, Sri C.—

Question re—

Bridge across Kanaya gode Ferry (North Malabar), construction of	456
Ferry service, collection of excess fares by ferry contractors in Malabar for	22
Headquarters Hospital, Badagara, acquisition of a site for extension of	7-8

Lakshmana Das, Sri L.—

Question re—

Calingapatnam Port, improvement of	447
Model agricultural farms, starting of	195-196

Lakshminarayana Reddy, Sri T.—

Question re—

Bridge across Venkajeru river, construction of	545
British Governor's photos, removal of, from Rajaji Hall	679
Bukkapatnam tank (Anantapur district), improving the water-supply resources of	469
Forest guards and watchers, increase of salary of	897
Gajulapalli tank, improvements to	892
Gruel centres in Kayalaseema, substitution of aengati for gruel in	468
Takkavi loans in Anantapur district, grant of	896

Questions and Answers—cont.

Latchanna, Sri G.—

Question re—

Backward classes, constitution of statutory Welfare Board for.	678
Bus route permits, proceed re for issue of	28
Co-operative Central Bank, Srikakulam, supersession of	994-996
Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Amendment Bill, dropping of	447-448
Estates taken over under the Estates (Abolition and Conversion into Ryotwari) Act, district war figures re	467
Ex-toddy tappers, employment for	302-303
Inam villages which are not estates after the passing of the Estates Land (Amendment) Act, 1936	467-468
Indian Evacuees and Dependents' Spinning and Weaving Co-operative Society, Yellamanchili, representation re mal-administration of	95
Kanur Lanka in West Godavari, Government's claim to — under the Estates Abolition Act	996-997
Kattubandi collection from darimila inam holders	778-779
Land, illegal alienations by zamindars of	783-784
Machkund Hydro-Electric Project, details re	528-530
Srikakulam and Visakhapatnam districts, constitution of a Development Board for	523-524

Mahamed Salih Maraikayar, Janab—

Question re Rent Reduction Act, alleged application of — to non-estate villages	1008
---	------

Mogral, Janab M. S.—

Question re—

Culinary essences, sale of — at blackmarket prices	399
Filariasis, prevention in Kasaragod town	12
Glass, Bead Training centres in the State, particulars re	1002-1003
Government Headquarters Hospital, Mangalore, facilities for tuberculosis patients in	532-533
Panchayat boards in South Kanara district, holding of election to	14-16
Political sufferers, assignment of land to	878-879

Moidu, Janab K.—

Question re Shri Shaila Industrial and Spiritual Colony Charities, adjudication of industrial dispute in	470
--	-----

Muni Reddi, Sri M.—

Question re—

American 'Hallet' pumpsets, purchase of	1000
Artesian wells in South Arcot district	986-987
Doddaball Anicut, execution of	787
Electricity supply to Hosur taluk	788
Lignite mining in South Arcot district	452-453
Livestock Research Station in Hosur, cost of maintenance and popularizing the results of experiments in	24-26
Livestock Research Station in Hosur, number of fishing tanks, in	106
Non-gazetted officers, grant of educational concessions to the children of	524-525
Schools and colleges, details re	464

Nagarajan, Sri V. R.—

Question re gruel centres in South Arcot district, opening of	675
---	-----

Narasimha Reddi, Sri P.—

Question re—

Bio-Chemist Research Laboratory, shifting of — from Kodur to Madras	1003-1005
Fire station at Rajampet, opening of	402-404
Land assignment to landless poor, applications for	676

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Narayana Kurup, Sri M.—

Question re—

Beypore port, development of	197-198
Coconut Research Station at Chowghat, opening of	200
Communal disturbance at Payyoli (North Malabar) in connection with cow-slaughter	387-388
District Board, Guntur, remarks regarding administration of	12-13
Dry and wet assessment in Malabar	464-465
Electricity, extension of — to Ottapalam, Malabar	537
Jenmi pattadars in Malabar, details re	26
Local bodies, running of bus transport and electricity services by	515-516
Lock-out in Malabar Mampuram Tile and Clay Works	201-202
Paddy procurement price, delay in payment of	777
Yarn purchase under card system, temporary suspension of	23

Narayana Nambiar, Sri M.—

Question re—

House-rent allowance, grant of — to Government servants in Hosdrug	180
Local Fund dispensary at Hosdrug, conversion into a Government hospital	516-517
Schools, opening of — in certain villages of Kasargod taluk	532
Waste land, forest land and land cultivated with coconuts, arecanuts and pepper in Kasargod taluk, extent of	468

Narayanan Nambiar, Sri T. C.—

Question re—

Arson in Chirakkal taluk in 1948-49	17-18
Malabar Tenancy Act, reduction of fair rent for pepper gardens fixed under the	537
Mobile motion picture vehicles of American Consulate, exemption from taxation of	201
Staff retrenched consequent on abolition of food control	876-877
Tuberculosis Sanatorium, Periyaram, North Malabar, completion of work on	884-885

Narayana Nappa, Sri S.—

Question re—

Calendering machine, installation in Rayalaseema	90
Dispensaries in panchayats, financial aid to	404
Foodgrains Movement Control Order, prosecutions under	5
Land revenue remission in Pe labilli village, Penukonda taluk	889
Mid-Pennar Project, investigation of	890
Teachers, revision of the salaries of	290
Tungabhadra High Level canal, inclusion in Five-Year Plan	199-200
Village panchayats, list of trained executive officers for	202-203

Narayanawamy, Sri M.—

Question re—

Fire station at Ongole, opening of	402
Nippatipadu tank (Ongole taluk), repair of	519
Tobacco barns, coal allotment to	787-788
Tour programmes of Ministers, particulars re	673-674

Padmaprabha Gounder, Sri M. K.—

Question re Indian nationals in Burma (Burma evacuees), repayment of subsistence allowance paid to	676
--	-----

Privilege motion re incorrectness of an answer to a question	763-764
--	---------

Rajam Ramaswami, Sri C.—

Question re

Panchayat boards, holding of elections to—under the Village Panchayats Act, 1950	539
--	-----

Questions and Answers—cont.

Q—cont.

PAGES

Rajeswara Rao, Sri M.—

Question re—

Agricultural loans granted to Harijans and Harijan Christians..	1006
Construction of a bridge across the Godavari at Alamuru ..	290
Fair price shops, procedure for appointment of dealers for ..	871-872
Grant of land in Unguturu Reserve Forest, West Godavari, to political sufferers ..	1006
Harijan Hostel, Masulipatnam, number of boarders, etc., in ..	894
Harijans, promotion to the Tahsildar's grade ..	773-774
Pattas, number applied for and granted in West Godavari district ..	682

Rama Rao, Sri G.—

Question re—

Deputy Collectors, abolition of direct recruitment to the posts of ..	103
Fair price shop for Government servants in Masulipatnam town ..	463
Higher Elementary School, Dokipparru, Krishna district, conversion into a middle school ..	531
Land, assignment to poor people ..	992-994
Land, encroachment by ryots of Dondapadu village ..	766-768
Non-Gazetted Officers' Association, Madras, separation of the Andhra Non-Gazetted Officers' Association (Central), Eluru, from ..	520
Police Sub-Inspectors, direct recruitment of ..	279-280
Staff retrenched consequent on abolition of food control ..	874-875
Waste land in Kaikalur taluk, extent of ..	893

Rama Rao, Sri P.—

Question re—

Administration of zamindari forests ..	988-989
Goat-browsing in zamindari forests, permission for ..	389-391

Rama Rao, Sri V.—

Question re—

Drama—Ban on Telugu play "Mundadugu" ..	90-91
Drama—Ban on Telugu play "Mahhomi" ..	91-93
Fair price shops in Krishna district, number and offtake after decontrol ..	458
Government Hospital, Nandigama, extension of ..	538
Lanka lands leased out to field labour co-operative societies, Krishna district, remission of rentals ..	669-670
People's rights in zamindari forests, press note on ..	789
Ration in upland and delta areas, rice content of ..	198-199
Rice, Export from Krishna district, prevention of ..	2-5
Well Subsidy Scheme, recovery of advances under the ..	190-192

Ramalingam, Sri S.—

Question re—

Craft Instructors of aided secondary schools, enhancement of salary of ..	13
Famine condition in Pattukkottai taluk ..	897
Kattalai High Level Canal ..	990-991
Lands, cancellation of assignments of—to some political sufferers in Tanjore district ..	291
Tanjore Municipal scavengers strike, action taken by Government ..	87

Ramaswami, Sri V. V.—

Question re—

Government business, transaction in regional languages (Tamil) ..	665-666
Municipal administration, reorganization of ..	1006

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Rangasami Reddiar, Sri P.—

Question re—

Bus permits, recipients of — during 1947–52 in Tiruchirappalli district	471
High Court, number of criminal appeals pending in the — on 1st April 1952	471
Police authorities in Karur, allegations against	785–786

Ratnaswamy, Sri A. M.—

Question re—Udamalpet Municipality, Reservation of seat for scheduled castes in	890
---	-----

Satyanarayana, Sri G.—

Question re Rural Medical training centres, number of	675
---	-----

Seetharamiah, Sri D.—

Question re—

Beedi workers, implementing the awards of Industrial Tribunal re—	450–452
Contour Bunding Scheme continuance, in Vayalpad taluk	984
Diet supplied in Jails, nutritive value of	105
Estates taken over in Chittoor district, number of	186–187
Housing scheme at Madanapalle, progress of	1000–1001
Madanapalle Theosophical High School, taking over the management of — by Government	277–278
Nutritive value of gruel supplied in gruel centres	196–197
School-fee concessions for poor Brahman students, grant of	395–396
Subsistence loans in Madanapalle, number of applications for	888
Tirupathi Srinivasa Textiles, taking over by Government	22–23
Weekly searches of Communist prisoners in jails	96–98

Sivasankara Reddi, Sri G.—

Question re—

Electricity, extension of power to villages around Hindupur from Hindupur supply station	536
Thermal station at Kadiri, construction of	201

Sri Krishna, Sri D.—

Question re—

Agricultural College, Bapatla, compensation for lands acquired for	20–21
Disafforestation of 800 acres in Kothapalem Reserve Forest, application for	198
Electricity supply to Bapatla Municipality	537
Harijan Welfare Department, Communities eligible for help by	301–302
Romperu Ryots' Association, representations from	776–777
Tank bed lands, assignment to political sufferers in Guntur district	193–195

Subba Reddi, Sri K.—

Question re—

Famine relief works in Palnad taluk	983–984
Registration fee, complaints about levy of — in Guntur district	667–668

Subramanian, Sri M. P.—

Question re—

Agricultural demonstrators, scales of pay of	891
Police Constables, supply of boots to	891–892

Swayamprakasam, Sri S.—

Question re District and Sessions Judge, information re — appointed by direct recruitment recently	526–527
--	---------

Syamasundara Rao, Sri P.—

Question re agricultural labourers, minimum wages for	657–659
---	---------

Thangavelu, Sri R.—

Question re Harijan Inspectors of Police promoted as Deputy Superintendents of Police in 1951–52, number of	551
---	-----

Questions and Answers—cont.

Urkavalan Sri P.—

Question re Vayali Malayadipatti tank, repair of 984-985

Vemiah, Sri S.—

Question re—

Andhra Paper Mills, working of	304
Artesian wells in South Arcot district, number and amount spent on	680-681
Artisans, supply of tools to—in Nellore district under Firka Development Scheme	547-548
Basic Training School, Pallipad, Nellore district, cost of building the	680
District Welfare Officers, supply of jeeps to—to speed up Harijan uplift work	546
Ex-toddy tappers, ameliorative measures for	303-304
Government servants, remarks in confidential files of	304
Kasturidevi High School, Nellore, building grant sanctioned for	893
Labour cases treated in Government Hospitals during 1949-52, number of	29
Lands reserved for depressed classes in Nellore district, alleged cultivation of—by caste ryots	680-681
Malaria cases treated in Government Hospitals in 1948-1952, number of	891
Manganese ore in Nellore district, mining of—	893
Medical officers deputed to Hyderabad State	304
Medical practitioners of Indigenous Medicine in rural dispensaries, grant of subsidy to	550
Nellore district, bifurcation of	892
Nellore district Inferior Servants' Association, representation from	548
Nurses deputed for training in the United Kingdom, particulars re	29
Paddy thrashing machines, manufacture of	549
Polytechnics and technological institutes, construction of buildings for	546-547
Poultry farms in the State, particulars re	546
Public Prosecutors, pay and daily fees of	682
Return of election expenses, expenditure incurred by the Government for action taken in cases of failure to lodge	549-550
Rural Industrialization Scheme of Visveswarayya, Sri M., implementation of	681
Rural Welfare Committee for Nellore district, composition of	545
Secondary grade Government Training school at Nellore, starting of	893
Starvation deaths in 1951-52, number of	678
Sulphuric acid industry, starting of—in Chittoor district	545
Takkavi and subsistence loans disbursed in Nellore district in 1952, amount of	544
Treasure trove in Singapet, Nellore district, alleged discovery of	680
Village Vaidyas, number and remuneration of	470-471
Water-supply, improvement of—in Tirupati town	550

Venkatasubbiah, Sri P.—

Question re—

Cattle-breeding co-operative societies in Cuddapah district, formation of	180-182
Co-operative Motor Transport Society for ex-servicemen at Cuddapah, organization of	782
Cuddapah South Forest Division, number of coupes leased out in	394
Dispensary in Obilivaripalli, Rajampet taluk, opening of	199
Foresters, instructions regarding transfer of	107

Q—cont.

Questions and Answers—cont.

Venkatasubbiah, Sri P.—cont.

Question re —

Roads laid under Famine Relief Scheme in Rayalaseema, maintenance of	670-671
Weavers' co-operative societies exclusively for Harijans, number of	104

Venkateswarlu, Sri Pillalamarri—

Question re—

Arts College, Cuddapah, dramatic performances for collecting funds for hostel of	679
Community projects, expenditure on and staff for	8-9
Drainage scheme for Tenali, estimate of cost	5-6
Electricity supply to Jaggayapet	882
Electricity supply to Nandigama taluk	883-884
Government Hospital, Munagala, working of	95-96
Government officers drawing Rs. 1,000 and above, number of	187-188
House-rent allowance, withholding of payment to menial staff, Tenali	23-24
Krishna Anicut, damages to	885-886
Law College, Madras, provision of a hostel for the students of	517-519
Legislative Assembly staff, overtime allowances paid to—during Budget session (June-July 1952)	668-669
Motor buses and cars, rates of tax from 1948 onwards	783
Munagala estate, enquiry into the dispute between the Zamindar and tenants	182-184
Tanks in Munagala estate, repair of	87,873-4
Water-supply scheme for Jaggayapet, sanction of	93

Venkiah Sri K.—

Question re—

Chinakula Sesha Sastri of Bapatla, death of	184-186
Guntur Tobacco Market Committee, inclusion of groundnut within the scope of	294-295
Lands, assignment of—to political sufferers	285
Procurement bonus, payment of—in certain villages of Bapatla taluk	775-776
S.S.L.C. Examination results, announcement of—in due time	527-528
Tobacco, fixation of minimum prices for	293-294
Tobacco re-drying plant at Guntur, setting up of	295-296

Vinayakam Sri K.—

Question re—

Co-operative department, strength of gazetted officers communitywar in	985-986
--	---------

Viswanatham, Sri T.—

Question re—

Community projects in the State, details re	534-535
Commutation rates of rent fixed under the Estates Land (Reduction of Rent) Second Amendment Act	452
Eviction of villagers of Kottur	296-298
Forest officials in Cuddapah district, complaint against the	998-1000
Government bus passenger tickets, printing of	300-301
Homeopaths, request for registration under the Medical Registration Act	531
Konduri Satyanarayana's death while in Police custody	459-461
Krishna Co-operative Central Bank, Masulipatnam, management of	298-299
Lands of aborigines in Wynaad, dispossession of	296
Legislators' Hostel, thefts in the	661-662
Paper used in Government offices, whether Indian or foreign	666-667
Pensioners, removal of the cut in dearness allowance and other reliefs for	662-664
Planning Commission, Report of the Technical Committee of—(Khosla Committee)	653-654

Questions and Answers—cont.

Viswanatham, Sri T.—cont.

Question re—cont.

Rajagopal Naidu's death while in Police lock-up	188-189
Rationing Officer, Malabar district, allegations against	870
Ravula Subba Rao's death while in Police lock-up	768-772
Rules under article 166 (3) of the Constitution	179-180
Taluk Supply Officer, Guntur, allegations of misconduct against	773

R

Raghava Mudaliar, Sri E. L.—	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	430

Rajachidambaram, Sri P. B. K.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1025
	1026

Rajagopal Naidu—

Question re death of—while in Police lock-up	188-189
--	---------

Rajagopala Rao, Sri K.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	719, 808-
	809, 837, 845-846
	899-900, 907, 910
	921-922.

Business of the House, discussion re'	898
---	-----

Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	307
---	-----

Rajagopalachari, the Hon. Sri C.—

Adjournment motion re—

Andhra State, Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast for the formation of ..	556-557
Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts	1013
Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	689-690
Eviction of landless poor in Musaveli village in Tanjore district ..	687
Students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools	795-796
Assembly proceedings, translation of	203-204
	305-306

Bills—

Cotton Control Bill, 1952	423
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	405, 408-
	409, 419
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Bill, 1952	485
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	493-494
	497-498

Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952

	560-561
	606, 609-615, 617, 693
	696, 702-704, 706, 708-
	709, 714, 716-717, 722
	725-729, 739, 750, 756-
	759, 798, 804-806, 811
	827-832, 859-861, 901
	905-910, 914-915, 938
	942, 944, 946, 948-953
	956, 963-964, 973-974
	1016, 1018, 1022-1023
	1025-1027, 1029-1030
	1033, 1073-1079.

Disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao	30, 108
--	---------

Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, amendment of Schedule II to the	431
--	-----

Resolution re—

Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	314-315,
	367-375

Handloom Industry	39, 135-
	145

R—cont.

Rajam Ramaswami, Sri C.— Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	259-261
<i>See Questions and Answers.</i>	
Rajan, Sri P. T.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	724-726
Raja rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar— Adjournment motion <i>re</i> retrenchment of workers in —	552-554
Rajaram, Sri K.— Leave of absence to Sri Kumaraswamy Raja Bahadur	31
Rajeswara Rao, Sri M.— <i>See Questions and Answers.</i>	
Raju, Sri K. T.— Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	321-324
Rama Rao, Sri G.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	913
Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	307, 353-355, 375
<i>See Questions and Answers.</i>	
Rama Rao, Sri P.— <i>See Questions and Answers.</i>	
Rama Rao, Sri V.— <i>See Questions and Answers.</i>	
Ramaiah Choudary, Sri K.— Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	331-334
Ramakrishna Reddy, Sri B.— Adjournment motion <i>re</i> students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools	796
<i>See Questions and Answers.</i>	
Ramalingam, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	170-172
	804, 814, 900-901
	910, 922-924.
Ramalingam Chettiyar Retrenchment Committee— <i>See Retrenchment Committee.</i>	
Ramalingiah, Sri Chandra— Bills—Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	497
<i>See Questions and Answers.</i>	
Ramamurthi, Sri P.— Adjournment motion <i>re</i> — Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts	1012
Famine and food policy of the Madras Government	793
Retrenchment of workers in RajaRajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar	552-553
Adjournment motion, rules <i>re</i>	100
Bills— Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Bill, 1952	475-477, 479
Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952	1082

	R—cont.	PAGE
Ramamurthi, Sri P.—cont.		
Bills—cont.		
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	489-491	
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection, Bill, 1952	558-559	
	561, 570-578, 692-	
	693, 696, 706-707, 709-	
	712, 714-715, 717-718	
	724, 726-728, 735-737	
	744-747, 755, 798-800	
	806-807, 810-812, 819-	
	820, 828-831, 834-836	
	847-849, 858-859, 861	
	863, 903, 906-909, 914	
	916-920, 934-938, 943-	
	945, 949-951, 967, 969-	
	970, 972-973, 1016-1018	
	1022, 1027-1029, 1044-	
	1048,	
Condolence resolution re death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur ..	445-446	
Ramasami, Sri V. V.—		
See Questions and Answers.		
Ramasami Thevar, Sri A.—		
See Questions and Answers.		
Ramesara, Sri K. V.—		
Bills—		
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	496-497	
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	173-174	
	739, 928,	
	1057-1058	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	52-53	
Ranga Rao, Sri K.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	246-247	
	833	
Rangasamy Reddiar, Sri P.—		
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	961-962	
	1014-1015, 1021-	
	1023	
See Questions and Answers.		
Rao, Sri C. V. K.—		
Bills—		
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	251-252	
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers)		
Bill, 1952	473, 475	
Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952	1080	
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	492-493	
Tanjore Tenants Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	236-237	
	607-609, 754, 816	
	843-845, 851-852	
Food situation in the State, debate on	236	
Motion re Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, amendment of Schedule		
II to the	432-433	
Resolution re—Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery.	307, 337-	
	342, 376	
Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh—		
Question re communal disturbances at Payyoli (North Malabar) in		
connexion with the anti-cow slaughter campaign of —		

Rathinam, Sri A.—

Bills—

District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	269-272
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	605-607

Rathnaswami, Sri A. M.—

Resolution re—economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	347-349
See Questions and Answers.	

Rayalaseema—

Question re steps taken for the economic development of — ..	539-543
--	---------

Registration fee—

Question re complaints about levy of — in Guntur district.. ..	667-668
--	---------

Rent Reduction Act—

Application of—to under-tenure estates and darimila inams in Vizianagram Estate	292-293
Question re alleged application of—to non-estate villages	1008

Repealing and Amending Bill, 1952—

See Bills

Resolution re—

Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	306-376
Handloom Industry	32-81, 108-148

Retrenchment—

Question re staff retrenched consequent on abolition of food control.	874-878
---	---------

Retrenchment Committee—

Question re recommendations of the Ramalingam Chettiar — implementation of	765-766
--	---------

Rice—

See Food.

Roads—

Question re maintenance of — laid under Famine Relief Scheme in Rayalaseema	670-671
---	---------

Rules—

Question re making of — under article 166 (3) of the Constitution ..	179-180
--	---------

Rulings—

Bills—Amendments—Scope of the Bill—

Amendments to enlarge the scope of the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill so as to make it applicable to all the other districts in the State also, are out of order. The scope of a Bill can be enlarged only by withdrawing it and bringing in a fresh Bill	1018, 1019 1027-1029
--	-------------------------

Bills—Select Committee Report—Presentation—

Select Committee Report need not be presented to the House if it is decided to drop the Bill	31
--	----

Rural Industrialization Scheme—

Question re implementation of the — of Visveswarayya, Sri M. ..	681
---	-----

Rural Medical practitioners—

See Medical practitioners.

Rural Medical Training Centres—

Question re number of —	675
---------------------------------	-----

Rural Welfare Committees—

Question re—

Nellore district—composition of	545
Nomination of non-officials to —	684

Rural Welfare Officers—

Question re qualifications prescribed for —	683-684
---	---------

Ryotwari areas—

Question re increase or decrease in the extent of wet areas in —	520-523
--	---------

S

Sahajananda, Sri A. S.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	591-592
.. .. .	971

Salem Jail—

Question re Communist (political) prisoners in — transfer to their native districts	765
---	-----

Salem Jail shooting incident—

See Papers laid on the table of the House.

Sambandam, Sri K. R.—

Bill—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	167-169
.. .. .	565-570, 720, 1059-1061
Resolution re Handloom Industry	70

Samia Koorayar, Sri G.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	237-239,
.. .. .	593-594

Sankara Reddi, the Hon. Sri N.—

Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	250, 256
.. .. .	415-418

Sankarayya, Sri B.—

Adjournment motion re elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	687-688
--	---------

Sarada river—

Question re letting of molasses from the Thummapala Sugar Factory in the —, prevention of	533-534
---	---------

Satyanarayana, Sri G.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	1058-1059
See Questions and Answers.	

Satyanarayana, Sri Konduri—

Question re death of—while in Police custody	459-461
--	---------

Scavengers—

See Strikes.

School-fee concessions—

Question re—	
Grant of — to Brahmin students	395-396
—for the children of non-gazetted officers	524-525

Schools—

Question re—	
Basic Training School, Pallipad, cost of the building of	680
Craft Instructors in aided secondary — in Tanjore, enhancement of pay of	13
Higher Elementary School, Dokipparu, Krishna district, conversion into a middle school	531
Kasturidevi Girls' High School, Nellore, building grant sanctioned for	893
Madanapalle Theosophical High School, taking over the management of—by Government	277-278
Opening of — in certain villages of Kasaragod taluk	532
and Colleges, details re	464
Secondary Grade Government Training School at Nellore, starting of	893
Telugu Pandits in secondary—promotion from lower grade to Grade I	781-782

S—cont.

Secondary School-Leaving Certificate Examination— Question re announcement of results in due time	527-528
Seetharamiah, Sri D.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	734-735 741-742, 813-815, 832, 833, 911-913
Resolution re — Handloom Industry	110-112
See Questions and Answers.	
Selvaraj, Sri P.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	587-589
Service Association— Question re	
Nellore District Inferior Servants' Association, representation from	543
Non-Gazetted Officers' Association, Madras, separation of the Andhra Non-Gazetted Officers' Association (Central), Eluru, from	520
Recognition of — by Government, rules re.	456-458
Services— See Government servants. See Public Service Commission, Madras.	
Shesha Sastri, Sri Chinakula— Question re death of —	184-186,
Shanmugam, Sri K.— See Questions and Answers.	
Shanmugam, Sri T.— Resolution re. — Handloom Industry	128-129
Shri Shaila Industrial and Spiritual Colony Charities— Question re adjudication of industrial dispute in —	470
Siddanna Gowd, Sri R.— Bills— District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	265-267
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	801, 905 961
Sivaprakasam, Sri V. S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	601-602
Sivaraaj, Sri N.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	592-593
Sivasankara Reddi, Sri G.— See Questions and Answers.	
Soundaram Ramachandran, Dr. T. S.— Resolution re Handloom Industry	119-120
South Madras Electric Corporation— Question re financial help to —	889
Speaker, Mr.— Adjournment motion re — Agrarian discontent in Romperu Drain Area	792
Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service Officer.	1010, 1011
Andhra State, Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast for the formation of — ..	554-558

Speaker, Mr.— cont.

Adjournment motion *re* — cont.

Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiruchirappalli districts	1012-1013
Educational facilities to backward class students	792
Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	687-690
Eviction of landless poor in Musaveli village in Tanjore district ..	685, 687
Famine and food policy of the Madras Government	792-793
Famine in Kakinada taluk	792
Famine in Nellore	791, 792
Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order	899
Landless labourers, Government order <i>re</i> grant of land on pattas to	791-792
Rent collection for grazing lands in Kanigiri taluk	791
Retrenchment of workers in Raja Rajeswari Weaving Mills, Azhikode, Malabar	552, 553, 554
Starvation deaths in Guntur	791
Students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools	793, 794, 795, 796
Varam price of paddy	792
Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks (West Godavari) ..	1013, 1014
Adjournment motion, rules <i>re</i>	789-790
Assembly proceedings, translation of	1008, 1010
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	559, 560, 561, 692, 693, 718, 733, 738, 742, 751, 797, 798, 808, 837
Business of the House, information <i>re</i>	898
Condolence resolution <i>re</i> death of Kumaraswamy Rajah Bahadur ..	445, 447
Food and famine conditions, request for a debate on	558
Panel of Chairmen, announcement of	30
Privilege motion <i>re</i> incorrect answer of a Minister to a supplementary question	763, 764
See Rulings.	
Special Armed Police Units—	
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Sri Krishna, Sri V.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	204-206
716, 733-734, 740-741	
See Questions and Answers.	
Srikakulam district—	
Question <i>re</i> Development Board for Visakhapatnam district and — constitution of	523-524
Sriramulu, Sri Potti—	
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> fast of — for the formation of the Andhra State	554-557
Stage Carriages (Surcharge) Bill, 1952—	
See Papers laid on the table of the House.	
Starvation deaths—	
Question <i>re</i> number of — in 1951-52	678
See Adjournment motions and Famine.	
State aid to Industries Act—	
Question <i>re</i> grant of loan to Mohan Industries, Limited, Tenali under —	392-394

S—cont.

State co-operative unions—	
Question <i>re</i> annual grants made to —	101-102
State Library Committee—	
<i>See</i> Library Committee.	
Stores—	
Question <i>re</i> purchase of — in England	677-678
Strike—	
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> students' — in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools	793-796
Question <i>re</i> Municipal scavengers' — in Tanjore, action taken by the Government <i>re</i>	87
Sub-Magistrate's Court—	
<i>See</i> Courts.	
Subba Rao, Sri Ravula —	
Question <i>re</i> death of — while in Police lock-up	768-772
Subba Reddi, Sri K.—	
Bills—	
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	734
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	499-500
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.	
Subbiah, Sri A. K.—	
Bills — Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	594-595
Subramaniam, the Hon. Sri C.—	
Adjournment motion <i>re</i> Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order	899
Bills—	
Bhavani Reservoir Irrigation Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1952	427-428
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	262,
267-269, 415, 417, 418	
Essential Articles Control and Requisitioning (Temporary Powers) Amendment Bill, 1952	473, 474,
477-479, 480-481, 484, 486	
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	560, 605,
606, 930-933, 935, 968-969, 1018, 1030	
Business of the House—	
Change in the order of —	439-441
Programme of —	235-898
Condolence resolution <i>re</i> death of Kumarasamy Rajah Bahadur	445
Disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao	108
Food and famine conditions, request for a debate on	107-558
Motion <i>re</i> change of non-official into official day (rule 24)	690
Subramaniam, Sri M. P.—	
<i>See</i> Questions and Answers.	
Subsistence allowance—	
Question <i>re</i> repayment of — paid to Indian Nationals in Burma	676
Subsistence loans—	
<i>See</i> Famine.	
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952—	
<i>See</i> Bills.	
Sulphuric acid—	
Question <i>re</i> starting of — industry in Chittoor district	545

S—cont.

PAGES

Survey and Boundaries Act, 1923—

See Papers laid on the table of the House.

Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952—

See Bills.

Suryanarayana R. ju, Sri Raja Sagi—

Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952

409-410

Swa minathan, Sri R. V.—

Nominated to the Panel of Chairmen

30

Swayamprakasam, Sri S —

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952

151-157

584-587, 612 694

696-699, 703-706

710-711, 1041-1044

See Questions and answers.

Swearing-in of Member—

C.andra Chudamani Deo, Sri Vyricherla

653

Syamesundara Rao, Sri P.—

See Questions and Answers.

T

Takkavi loans—

Question re — in Anantapur district, grant of

896

Taluk Supply Officer, Guntur—

Question re allegations of misconduct against the —

773

Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952—

See Bills

Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal (Protection) Ordinance—

See Papers laid on the table of the House.

Tank —

Question re—

Bukkapatnam — in Anantapur district, improving the water-supply

resources of

469

Gujalapalli tank, improvements to

892

Nippatipadu — in Ongole taluk, repair of

519

In Munagala Estate, repairs to —

873-874

Vayali-Malayadipatti tank, repair of

984-985

Tank bed lands—

See Land.

Teachers—

Question re revision of the salaries of —

290

Technological institutes—

Question re construction of buildings for certain—

546-547

Telugu Pan-lits—

See Schools.

Temples—

Question re Hindu — in Malabar, appointment of non-caste Hindus as executive officers of

454

Tenancy Legislation—

Question re enactment of — for the entire State

280-281

Thangavelu, Sri R.—

See Questions and Answers.

Thermal station—

See Electricity.

Thimma Reddi, Sri P.—

Bills—District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952

257-259

Condolence resolution re death of Kumaramy Rajah Bahadur

446

No nominated to the Panel of Chairman

30

Resolution re—

Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery

344-347

Handloom Industry

55-56

T—cont.

PAGES

Thinakaraswamy Thevar, Sri S.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	169-170
Tirupathi Srinivasa Textiles—	
Question re taking over of — by Government	22-23
Tobacco—	
Question re fixation of minimum prices for —	293-294
Tobacco barns—	
Question re coal allotment for each tobacco barn, quantity of	787-788
Tobacco Market Committee (Guntur)—	
Question re inclusion of groundnut within the scope of —	294-295
Tobacco redrying plant—	
Question re setting up of a — at Guntur	295-296
Transport—	
Question re—	
Bus route permits, procedure for issue of	28
Bus route permits, recipients of — during 1947 to 1952 in Tirupathi-rappalli district.	471
Buses permitted to run a second trip each day, number of	7
Co-operative Motor Transport Society for ex-servicemen at Cuddalore, organization of a	782
Government Transport bus passenger tickets, printing of	300-301
Revision of bus fares on Kozhikode-Kakkodi route	672-673
Running of bus — services by local bodies	515-516
Tax on cars and buses, rates from 1948 onwards	788
Tirurkkad-Anakkayam (Malabar) bus route, opening of	102-103
See Motor Vehicles Act.	
Treasure-trove—	
Question re alleged discovery of — in Singaper, Nellore district	680
Tuberculosis Fund—	
Question re disposal of Pudukkottai State—	882
Tuberculosis Sanatorium—	
Question re — in Periyaram, completion of construction of	884-885
Tungabhadra High Level Canal—	
Question re inclusion of — in the Five-year plan	199-200
Turmeric—	
Question re collection of excess water-tax for cultivation of — in Krishna Western Delta	104-105

U

Udamalpet Municipality—

See Elections

Urkavalan, Sri P.—

See Questions and Answers.

V

Vadivelu, Sri S.—

 Bills Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 239-241
803

Vans—

Question re — supplied to the Deputy Prohibition Officer, Villupuram 283

Varadachari, Sri K.—

 Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 595-598
963, 966
 Resolution re Handloom Industry 49-51

Veerabhadram, Sri M.—

Privilege motion re incorrectness of an answer to a question 763, 764

Veloo, Sri A.—

Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 602-604

V—cont.

PAGES

Vema Reddy, Sri K. V.— Resolution <i>re</i> economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	324-326
Vemiah, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	233, 825 833, 839 840, 900
See Questions and Answers.	
Venkaiah, Sri K.— Resolution <i>re</i> — Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery Handloom Industry	307, 375 69-70
See Questions and Answers.	
Venkajeru river— See Bridges.	
Venkata Jagga Rao, Sri R.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 .. Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry	1049-1050 80-81 108-110
Venkatarama Ayyar, Sri S.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	581-584 1054-1056
Venkatarama Raju, Sri A.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	841
Venkataramiah, Sri N.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	747, 940- 941
Venkata Rao, Sri Saka— High Court's judgment <i>re</i> the disqualification of —	29-30 107-108
Venkatasubba Reddi, Sri T. N.— Bills— District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	411 755-756 846-847 955
Venkatasubbiah, Sri P.— Resolution <i>re</i> Handloom Industry See Questions and Answers.	132-133
Venkataswami Naidu, the Hon. Sri K.— Bills—Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952 ..	1079-1083
Venkatesa Sholagar, Sri P.— Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 ..	589-590 800, 820- 821, 927
Venkateswarlu, Sri Pillalamarri — Adjournment motion <i>re</i> students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools Adjournment motions, rules <i>re</i> Assembly proceedings, translation of	793, 794, 795 1008 305 482-483
Bills— Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952 Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	494 693 713-715, 726, 728 737-739, 824 829 836, 845, 934-956 974, 1014, 1030-1031

V—cont.

PAGES

Venkateswarlu, Sri Pillalamarri—cont.	
Disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao	30, 108
Resolution re —	
Handloom Industry	38, 45-48
Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	307
See Questions and Answers.	
Venkatrama Ayyar, Sri S.—	
Bills—Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	157-160
Village Vaidyas —	
Question re number and remuneration of —	470-471
Vinayakam, Sri K.—	
Adjournment motion re allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service officer	1011
Bills—	
Indian Registration (Madras Amendment), Bill 1952	1081, 1083
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	699-700, 704
823-824, 827, 830	
836, 903-904, 916	
920-921, 947, 960-961	
968, 1025, 1056-1057	
Resolution re Handloom Industry	48-49
See Questions and Answers.	
Visakhapatnam district —	
Question re Development Board for Srikakulam district and —, constitution of	523-524
Viswanatham, Sri K. R.—	
Bills—Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952	1080-1082
Resolution re economy and efficiency in administrative machinery. .. .	349-352
Viswanatham, Sri T.—	
Adjournment motion re —	
Allegations of corruption against an Indian Civil Service officer	1010
Andhra State, Sri Potti Sriramulu's fast for the formation of	555-557
Cyclone havoc in Tanjore and Tiru-hirappalli districts	1013
Elections to minor panchayats by show of hands	688-689
Foodgrains Levy Procurement Order	899
Students' strikes in Andhra Desa against the detention system in high schools	794, 795
796	
Water scarcity in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks (West Godavari). .. .	1014
Adjournment motions, rules re	790, 1008
Assembly proceedings, translation of	203-204
305-306	
Bills—	
Christian Marriages Validation Bill, 1952	420
Cotton Control Bill, 1952	421-422
District Boards (Amendment) Bill, 1952	260-262,
413-415, 416, 417, 418	
Sugar Factories Control (Amendment) Bill, 1952	495-496
Survey and Boundaries (Amendment) Bill, 1952	487
Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952	149-151
233, 234, 249, 560, 561, 605	
606, 615-617, 695, 72, 704	
733, 752-753, 759, 811	
850-851, 925-26, 948, 950	
957-960, 964-966, 1024	
1021, 1023-1024, 1072-1073	

Viswanatham, Sri T.—cont.

Business of the House, programme of	235, 898
Disqualification of Sri Saka Venkata Rao, High Court's judgment on	29-30 107-108 107, 557-558
Food and famine conditions, request for a debate on —	558
Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1931, amendment of Schedule II to the	431-434
Privilege motion <i>re</i> incorrectness of an answer to a question	764
Resolution <i>re</i> —	
Economy and efficiency in administrative machinery	314, 315, 362-367, 369
Handloom Industry	135
See Questions and Answers.	

Vizianagram Estate—

See Estates.

W

Water scarcity—

Adjournment motion <i>re</i> — in Polavaram and Kovvur taluks (West Godavari)	1013-1014
---	-----------

Water-supply—

Question <i>re</i> —	
Drinking — to Coshin, provision of	370
Improvement of — in Tirupati town	550

Water-supply scheme—

Question <i>re</i> sanction of — for Jaggayyapet	93
--	----

Water tax—

Question <i>re</i> —	
Collection of excess — from cultivators of turmeric in Krishna Western Delta	104-105
—charged under different irrigation systems	465-466
—in Artesian well areas in South Arcot	986-987

Weavers' co-operative societies—

Question <i>re</i> —	
Exemption of — from payment of audit fees in 1951-52	103
Number of — exclusively for Harijans	104

Well-Subsidy Scheme—

Question <i>re</i> —	
Recovery of advances made under —	190-192
Recovery of loan granted to Sri Appala Narasimha Raju under —	396-397

Y

Yarn—

Question <i>re</i> —	
Purchase of — under card system, temporary suspension of	23
Reduction of price of —	462-463
Supply of — for making fishing nets, procedure for	461

Z

Zamindari forests—

See Forests.

